

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. V

APRIL, 1905

NO. 10

An American Socialism.

SOCIALISM is either an evolutionary science or it is no science at all. If it is an evolutionary science it should develop in its most advanced form in the United States where the development of industry is the most advanced.

Karl Marx who has been outgrown in Europe must become an historical reminiscence in the United States. So far America has had no Karl Marx nor is it certain that we shall ever have one. But the Socialist movement in America will certainly develop a philosophical backbone which will mean to America what Marxism has meant to Germany.

More than any other American writer, Prof. Thorstein Veblen has foreshadowed what this backbone will be. A professor in the most American of all cities, Chicago, on the pay roll of the University founded by John D. Rockefeller, a deep student of international Socialism as well as of the classical and historical schools of political economy and one of the keenest observers of contemporary society in this country, Prof. Veblen is well equipped for the task. He is not a propagandist, but a scientific observer. In this capacity, it is manifestly incorrect to call him a Socialist. But if he is not a defender of any proposed industrial or political changes, it is equally certain that he defends no existing institution, however great its sanctity.

In Prof. Veblen's view the business man, and not the great capitalist, figures as the enemy of society. But Prof. Veblen's business man differs from Marx's capitalist in the most fundamental manner. Though the Professor mercilessly flays the business men, he yet concedes that they are "honorable men, all, most honorable men,"—in other words, that they doubtless believe in themselves. This harmless and, in America at least, just con-

cession to the business man, Marx was never willing to grant. He always impugned their motives. Why, we are at a loss to say. Perhaps the German capitalist is a brutal cynic, as Marx implied. Certainly the American business man is not a cynic, but rather an unsympathetic, unintellectual person, blinded by his own environment and interests. Marx seemed to address the capitalist. Apparently either he wished to make him suffer or he hoped to convert him. The former position is savage, the latter that very Utopianism that Marx pretends to abhor. Veblen does not expect that American Socialists will either address themselves to the ruling class or condemn them. Business men, like all others, are the product of their environment. They cannot be converted. When they have lost their power to the other classes in the course of economic evolution, they will be ignored.

Veblen agrees with Marx that his "business men" are as useless to society as Marx's capitalists. But Veblen attributes to the men that govern industry a dominant motive of an entirely different character, not mere exploitation, but love of exploitation for its own sake and the sincere belief that exploitation is for the benefit of the human race. The American business man not only exploits, he thinks, lives, eats and breathes exploitation. Above all he believes in exploitation and he believes in himself.

Now, what fundamental differences this view must make not only in social philosophy, but in every step and movement in practical politics as well. If business men seek power for the sake of power, it is impossible to expect them to take any initiative in the remodelling of society, whatever. If they were governed rather as Marx claimed, by their love of gain alone, they might be touched on that tender spot. Veblen's view, then, is not only more evolutionary, but also more revolutionary than that of Marx's.

Veblen's economic standpoint is in the sharpest distinction to that of Marx. Both agree that Socialism is to be brought about a step at a time. But Marx, and still more his followers, have looked forward to the ripening of one industry after another for democratic control. Veblen, guided by the tremendous economic advance of the United States, has seen the lines that divide one industry from another breaking down, all the new trusts and monopolies becoming inter-related and organized capital growing into one complete whole. In other words the men who control the great railroads, banks and industrial trusts are the same. Under these conditions, then, the step at a time is likely rather to lie in the decrease of the power of the smaller business men over the government, in the corresponding increase of numerical importance of the industrial class and the growth of Socialism within that class. The trusts will not bring about Socialism by ripening industries for it one at a time, but will hold it back

by increasing a hundred-fold the difficulty of taking the first step against their consolidated power.

The capitalist system will not fall of its own weight. There is no possibility of a cataclysm. The problem of disposing of the growing surplus for which foreign markets are so urgently demanded, can be easily disposed of by the ruling class. The methods of doing this are two-fold. Either the country can be hurled into international war and all the wasteful preparations that precede and degradations that follow international war, or a benevolent feudalism can be developed. If the trusts continue their present rapid rate of growth, the latter seems the more likely outcome.

How the surplus will be disposed of in that case, Prof. Veblen showed in his recent book on the leisure class in America. Here Veblen conceded that the business man himself does not waste any vast sums in consumption, however wasteful and anti-social may be his operations in production. In consumption it is his wife and children who spend the money. To the possibilities of consumption in this line, there is no limit. If the money-making sport comes to an end on account of the complete organization of industry by the great financiers, then the vast sums formerly manipulated by the business men for various speculative purposes will be entirely turned over to his wife and children who have already made such splendid records in extravagant living and "conspicuous waste."

In the book just mentioned, Prof. Veblen not only shows this waste, but he analyzes its causes. These are an effort to spend money in an emulative manner in order to make obvious to all observers either the amount of wealth owned or the length of time it has been in the possession of the family. Expenditure, in other words, is not for material brute comforts as Marx and all his followers have supposed. To such expenditures there is a physical limit. To the very "spiritual purpose" on the other hand of showing off a supposed social superiority which may take the form of innumerable houses, servants, diamonds, laces, etc., there is no limit whatever. There need be no more crises or underconsumption if capitalists work this outlet for its full value.

Between international war and "conspicuous waste" there is no danger of the capitalist ever becoming seriously embarrassed by the surplus. In Marx's time the petty bourgeois ideal of personal economy and rational living prevailed widely. In our times the ruling element in the ruling classes everywhere are troubled with no such scruples. Even the "simple life" requires enormous expenditures in charity and display of a "quiet" kind.

Veblen has revolutionized the materialistic conception of

history. In a far deeper sense than Marx he sees the dominance of environment on human progress. With Veblen environment not only shapes the interests and opinions of all classes, but it holds the very feelings, tastes and habits of thought of every individual: With Marx possessions and the legal status of an individual fixed his class. With Veblen the man's whole life environment determines his attitude to life. The business man is more deeply perverted according to Veblen than the capitalist according to Marx.

The thinking working people are Socialists not so much because their interests are opposed to those of their employers as because their minds are constituted differently, because they have different standards and different ideals of life. To be sure these were themselves shaped by the material environment. But the immediate and determining force that governs their attitude is not their legal status or lack of prosperity, as Marx claimed, nor even the compelling power of new industrial conditions. It is rather their disregard for the institution of property and for all the "foundations of society" on which the business classes rely to keep them in subjection. With Veblen the material environment has its principal influence through the human mind.

The class struggle of Veblen is not the class struggle of Marx. Marx's class struggle was a conflict of interests. Veblen's is a conflict of minds (not of ideas but of mental character and habit of thought.) There is a crucial test between the two views. If, according to Marx's view, an individual should by any accident or exceptional qualities, be suddenly taken out of one class and put into another, he should, after a very short space of time, become imbued with the principles of the new class to which he was transferred. No such sudden changes are possible if Prof. Veblen is right. The individual so transferred might become silent. He might be bribed into acquiescence. He might repeat in a parrot-like manner the formulas of the new class in which he had arrived, but he could not, if his life had been sufficiently moulded in the other class, become an able or active factor in the defense of the new one. The difference between the classes is not a difference of interests, but a physical, mental and moral contrast in the very nature of the individuals that compose them. It is far deeper than anything Marx or his principal followers have supposed.

Moreover, Prof. Veblen's working class is very differently defined from that of Marx. The only classes, he says, which are certain to be influenced by the extreme socialistic frame of mind are the skilled mechanical trades. On the other side are the lawyers, the bankers, the business men, clergymen and politicians. With these are also the rural population "including the population of the country towns and in an eminent degree the

smaller farmers of the remoter country districts; so also the delinquent classes of the cities and the populace of the half-civilized and barbarous countries. The body of unskilled workers, especially those not associated with the men in the skilled mechanical trades, are not seriously affected." It is not the propertyless classes, the proletarians, the wage-earners, that are affected by Socialist sentiments as Marx claimed, but rather those engaged in industrial or scientific as distinct from pecuniary or business employments. If Marx is right and Veblen is wrong, the majority of the community being without any considerable accumulation of capital, ought to be Socialists at the present moment. But the majority of the community is not only not converted to Socialism, but is radically and fundamentally opposed to it. This is perfectly natural according to Veblen's view since the business men plus the farmers plus the hand trades, and not the machine workers, constitute a majority of the community and will continue to do so for several decades or perhaps a generation to come.

Still Veblen concludes that economic evolution will bring about Socialism. At present only the minority of the community is organized under the new industrial regime as machine workmen, superintendents or scientists. Only these are capable even of grasping the Socialist view. Ultimately, they will certainly constitute the majority. In the meanwhile the business men, from the large capitalists to small farmers or some element between, will continue to control the community.

Socialism, according to Veblen, must base its hopes on the future development of the advanced industries, on economic evolution, rather than on Socialist propaganda. The most that propaganda can do is to educate the industrial classes to the new standpoint. This he believes is being very rapidly accomplished.

"When distrust of principles rises to such a pitch," says Prof. Veblen, "as to become intolerant of all pecuniary institutions and leads to a demand for the abrogation of property rights rather than a limitation for them, it is spoken of as 'Socialism' or 'anarchism.'"

Prof. Veblen does not attempt a closer definition of the Socialist position. He does not even mention the public ownership of the instruments of production, distribution and exchange. No radical Socialist is so suspicious of this public ownership idea as Prof. Veblen, since he ignores it altogether. "The constructive proposals of the Socialists," he says, "are ill-defined and inconsistent and almost entirely negative." In Prof. Veblen's view this is the essence of the scientific attitude of mind and the acme of all praise. The vagueness and inconsistency of their constructive proposals, he says, is only to be taken as evidence that

the attitude of the Socialists cannot be expressed *in terms of the institutions as at present in force.*

In other words, new words and new phrases not yet in use, will have to be found for each one of the elements in the Socialistic position. It is less and less capable of being formulated as a *business proposition*. But Prof. Veblen has shown that practically all business is parasitic in its nature. To say that Socialism is not business-like is to say that it is not based on exploitation. Prof. Veblen explains himself by saying that the vagueness of this Socialist position should not allow it to be confused with mere class hatred or general discontent. Many other revolutionary movements have had these features, but Socialism, though it is a revolt against all existing institutions, always founds its protest on the fact that existing economic organization is outgrown. Prof. Veblen then develops a view of a revolutionary character of the Socialist movement that is as broad, if not broader, than any other that has ever been suggested even by the most revolutionary Socialists.

"The Socialist sentiment," he explains, "is threatening, unprecedented, and perplexing for practical men of affairs to deal with." It not only attacks the "natural rights and institutions of property" as the unions do in a very similar manner, but it is distinguished from the union movement by a similar failure of regard for all "other articles of institutional furniture handed down from the past." It may be observed, however, that the average workman, and therefore the average union, is also pretty well permeated with a lack of reverence for most existing institutions. The Socialists alone have formulated their irreverence into a philosophy.

As to politics, Prof. Veblen says "it seems to be their belief that the community can get along without political institutions. On this head again, the Socialists have nothing consistent to offer." (Remember, Prof. Veblen does not over-value mere consistency). But "their political bias is radically democratic," and they are "completely opposed to the state as the conception is at present understood." That the Professor does not consider their disregard for existing political institutions a sign of unintelligence may be seen in his own treatment of politics which he places among the archaic vocations along with "war, fashion and religion."

Socialism not only attacks the economic and political structure, but also accepted moral truths. It "brings about a weakening of convictions as to the full truth and beauty of the received institutions without much consensus as to what is to be done about it, if *anything*." It is to be hoped that the humor of this paragraph has not escaped any of Prof. Veblen's readers.

Religious conceptions are equally undermined in the work-

ingmen's minds. "The cultural era (beginning in the 18th century) of Natural Rights, Natural Liberty and Natural Religion reduced God to the rank of a 'Great Artificer'." (Because this was the age of the artificer and handicraftsman). "The machine technology is in turn relegating him to that fringe of minor employments and those outlying industrial regions to which the handicraftsmen have been retired."

Finally, and at the bottom of all, the industrial revolution has completely revolutionized the workingman's way of thinking. Before the machine age the causes of a given effect were not thought of as themselves effects; that is, causes were thought as final. This, according to the present mode of thought, they never are. Similarly, if the cause was the beginning, the effect was treated as the end of a chain and not as itself a cause of succeeding effects. The machine technology has done away with all this. Being a mechanical or material process, it requires the attention to be centered on the process itself and not on the original causes or the final effects of the process. To the machine worker the process comes to count and is the substantial fact that engages his attention. The modern workmen learn to think in terms of the process. They have come to think and to feel as people never thought or felt before.

This American Socialism is not based on any outworn Hegelian logic nor on any absolute and therefore unscientific social philosophy. It is entirely twentieth century science, viewing society as all the rest of the universe as in a perpetual condition of evolution, and forsaking all accepted terms and formulas as unfit for scientific use.

The American people also take a relative view of life. In the limited sphere in which American life has moved, the prevailing views are almost scientific in their character. The American manufacturer has no absolute views with regard to machinery, labor or industry. He is governed scientifically by the working hypothesis. To a lesser degree the same holds true of the whole community. Absolute views do not and cannot prevail in the practical life that dominates America as it never dominated any other nation in the world before.

As Hegel observed fifty years ago, there is no political life in America because no social classes have yet been forced to a lower level of life than they have been accustomed to. The Americans have so far no constructive political idea, no practical aims in politics. But when the nation does turn its attention to politics with the same spirit, the same vigor and the same absolute determination to achieve results with which it has devoted itself to industry and business, who can doubt that the ruling ideas will be practical or relative in their character?

But there must be ruling ideas and working hypotheses, and

none have yet taken hold on the community. Prof. Veblen has done his part to indicate very broadly what these ideas will be. It remains for those who are going to assume the real leadership of the industrial classes to build up with them a practical American philosophy and program. That it will have an international basis, there can be no doubt. That the technical advance of all civilized countries follows along similar lines, there can be no question. Neither will any one deny that industry is gradually being established on the basis of a world market. But especially under the capitalist regimes which govern every nation with scarcely any check to-day, the development will have to be national, the whole world knows that America must lead. The crisis may be more acute elsewhere. The economically trained, the educated, the independent and vigorous people of this country will not require a crisis to make them see the light.

WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING.

Concerning the Chicago Manifesto.

THE Manifesto, beside being a call for a Convention, is a general statement of workingclass conditions, of the principles which should underlie industrial organization, and of the ideal by which such an organization should be animated. That men who have been accustomed to viewing the American Labor Movement from different points should place different interpretations upon the text of the Document, is but natural. Organized Labor is undoubtedly in a critical state of evolution. Various elements, hitherto kept apart by fundamental tactical differences, are now given opportunity to work, if possible, in unison. Perfect accord may be unattainable. But the Manifesto does state certain facts. These facts leave to the June Convention not a formulation of principles, but a definite working out of a plan of organization based upon the principles set forth in the Manifesto. If harmony is to characterize the deliberations of the Convention, the nature of these fundamentals should be settled at once by mutual discussion on the part of those favorably disposed to the new movement. In the following remarks I am forced to take a position quite at variance with that outlined in the leading editorial of the February number of this *Review*. But I believe that I am expressing the opinion of quite a majority of those present at the Chicago Conference.

First, as to the "Timeliness" of the proposed movement. Regarding this feature the editorial in question contains the following statement:

"The one question then is, is the present the proper time for such a change to come? If it is not, then this organization will be a thing born out of due time, a cause of disorder, confusion and injury."

This question of "Timeliness" requires a double answer:

(1) The members of the Chicago Conference quite unanimously held that a Socialist political movement, unsupported by an industrial, classconscious union, is doomed to a hopeless chasing of rainbows. Hence, whenever and wherever the time is ripe for a Socialist movement, it cannot be unripe for industrial unionism.

(2) On the economic field, apart from the Socialist political movement, all that the Editor can mean by putting the question of "Timeliness," is whether economic conditions are ripe for a bona fide Working Class organization instead of a bogus, craft-divided, Capitalist-owned machine. Certain features of the

European Working Class movement may suggest an answer to this phase of the question.

The Socialists of Germany, over thirty years ago, "smashed" the "pure and simple" organization promoted by Schulze-Delitsch, because those organizations were founded upon crookedness and ignorance. Was not this classic bit of "Union-wrecking" timely? But the industry of Germany a generation ago was conducted almost solely by petty capitalist concerns; and the German Working-Class had at that time no experience in organization.

Russia is still in an extremely backward industrial condition. Yet when her officials came to the United States with the purpose of studying the perfect methods here developed by the "Labor Leaders" for keeping the workers in subjection and ignorance; and when those officials returned to Russia and proceeded to make use of the newly-learned methods in preference to those developed by their own Autocracy, shall we question the "Timeliness" of our Russian comrades' opposition to "pure and simpledom?"

In connection with these observations, those interested should not fail to read George Estes' article in the February number of *The Voice of Labor* entitled, "The Wolf Has Shown His Teeth." In it the writer shows to what brutal, horrible lengths the A. F. of L. bosses and grafters are going in their frenzied efforts to destroy the A. L. U. (and, we might add, all industrial unions). No wonder the article contains the most drastic indictment of the A. F. of L. ever penned. "Of course," says Estes, "such utterly disreputable methods as these are so degraded in character that a Zulu, an inhabitant of the Fiji Islands or even a cannibal of the South Sea, would scorn to employ them. * * * The wolf has shown his teeth."

If in Estes' mind there is any doubt as to whether this is the proper occasion to attack the A. F. of L., it does not appear at first reading of this article.

A generation after the publication of the *Communist Manifesto* the A. F. of L. was launched by fakirs and ignoramuses and dedicated to the proposition that slavery should endure forever. When, in the early 90's, a class-conscious Socialist movement had developed it found itself face to face with its most deadly enemy, the Capitalist A. F. of L. To carry the warfare into the camp of this sneaking opponent, and at the same time to train the workers for self-government under Socialism, the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance was organized in 1895. The teeth of the wolf were then sharper than those which are now sinking into the flesh of the A. L. U. in the West. But no one who then understood the movement questioned the "Timeliness" of attacking the beast with every weapon in the armory of the class-conscious forces. The so-called "Good-Times" of 1897-1902, made the

struggle intensely bitter. By juggling figures the A. F. of L. attempted to prove that it was "raising the wages of the working-class." All but the staunchest opponents chose the "easier road to Socialism." Or, to use Hagerty's newly-coined expression, the "pure and simple political Socialist" movement was launched. And so matters hung for some time. But now the stench of rotting "pure and simpleness" is driving its cleaner adherents to Socialism and industrial unionism.

For a Socialist to attack the leaders of the A. F. of L. and then partially excuse the system of which they are the natural fruitage, is exactly as reasonable as for him to attack the leaders of the Republican and Democratic Parties and then hastily make amends to the organizations themselves. Are Gompers and Mitchell "worse" than the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, one of the "constituent organizations" which was organized by the great capitalists for the purpose of beating down at once the small capitalists and the workers? It really does seem peculiar to so often hear it scientifically explained that Dick Croker and J. Edward O'Sullivan Addicks are but the natural product of capitalist politics, and then listen to the same person say, probably in all sincerity, that if the "clique" which rules the A. F. of L., were only dynamited, all would be lovely in the labor unions.

The A. F. of L., considered from the point of view of the workers' interests, is a patchwork of hypocrisy and lies. Such it always has been. And such it will be until destroyed, root and branch, by an outraged rank and file. That the workers put no faith in the fallacy that a few "leaders" are responsible is shown by the desertion of hundreds of thousands who refuse longer to have anything to do with the old thing. (See Manifesto, from Alpha to Omega).

Nor is the transformation from such a negation of all rectitude as is the A. F. of L., to the principles of organization laid down by the Manifesto so easy as at first blush it may appear. As to "boring from within," the editorial in question declares not only that this method should be pursued, but also that "the place for a man is within the union of his craft." How different from this has been the position of those who, all along, have favored industrial unionism. If "the place for a man is within the union of his craft," we wonder what would happen to the United Brotherhood of Railway Employees, the United Brotherhood of Builders, or any others who wish, through working class organizations, to save themselves from the tar-barrel of craftism. The Manifesto expressly provides that workers who may rebel against the "unions of their craft" may be seated in the June Convention as individuals. For, undoubtedly, many who cannot be represented by delegates, will prefer fighting the wolf from the outside to being swallowed up with the question-

able purpose of directing the brute's movements from the inside.

Furthermore, we are told that "the trade union that connects itself with the new organization need not in any way alter internal organization and management."

The editorial had previously pointed out that the A. F. of L. "official clique," through "highly paid organizers," made it a business "to organize trade-unionists into rings and factions for the purpose of maintaining the rule of the leaders." Now the Manifesto declares that, in the new organization, "All power should rest in the collective membership." Does this not suggest some little alteration as to "internal management?"

Then as to reorganization—the change from craftism to the class-conscious industrial principle so boldly proclaimed by the Manifesto—does this not mean a right-about-face as to the whole nature and purpose of organization? We think it does. The class-conscious spirit is not had for the asking. Its possession on the part of the workers of this country within the next ten years means that all the means of education we can bring to bear must be added to the primal force of present economic conditions.

Finally, no false impression should be created by that sentence of the Manifesto, which, perhaps more than any other, was deemed essential to the success of the new movement:

"It should be established as the economic organization of the Working Class, without affiliation with any political party."

As regards this crucial matter, the Conference provided against possible misinterpretation of the sentence quoted, in other and equally significant articles:

(1) "Craft divisions foster political ignorance among the workers, thus dividing their class at the ballot-box, as well as in the shop, mine and factory."

(2) "It (the present economic organization) is blind to the possibility of establishing an industrial democracy, wherein there shall be no wage-slavery, but where the workers shall own the tools which they operate and the products of which they alone enjoy."

Every industrial unionist who thoroughly understands the deeper mission of his organization, will reach class-conscious political action. An industrial union cannot increase the average wage. In some cases it may be less likely than the craft unions (labor-trusts), to prevent the decrease of wages. Its mighty mission results from the fact that it prepares the way to the Socialist Republic, the final goal of any honest Working Class movement. And this way cannot be traveled without the possession of political power. Many industrial unionists may oppose Socialism through mere ignorance. But most political "So-

cialists" who fight industrial unionism are about as deeply imbued with Socialism as was Judas Iscariot with Christianity. Socialist to the core must the new economic organization be, or the storm of the class-struggle will beat up another wreck on the rocks of "time-serving diplomacy." And when the June Convention has painted the skull and crossbones on the door of "pure and simpledom," that last Working Class compromise with Capitalism, there will probably issue a political organization strong in numbers, but stronger in principle, because raised by the revolutionary spirit high above "mere vote-getting subterfuge."

FRANK BOHN,

Organizer Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance.

A Reply.

THESE are some things in the preceding article by Comrade Bohn which require immediate notice. Others will be covered in a later article which I have in preparation for the press on the general subject of industrial unionism, and still others are covered by the editorial in this number. In the first place it should be thoroughly understood that neither Comrade Bohn nor myself speak for anybody but ourselves, at least so far as the industrial union conference or the Socialist Party is concerned. I do not know to how great a degree he directly represents De Leon and the S. L. P. and S. T. and L. A. As is pointed out editorially the statement that "the Socialists of Germany over thirty years ago smashed the pure and simple organization promoted by Schulze-Delitzsch" is absolutely untrue. These unions were never smashed but are still going on and growing in strength, although very much slower than the Socialist unions. He makes a sweeping statement concerning the A. F. of L.: "A generation after the publication of the Communist Manifesto the A. F. of L. was launched by fakirs and ignoramuses and dedicated to the proposition that slavery should endure forever. When, in the early 90's a class-conscious Socialist movement had developed it found itself face to face with its most deadly enemy, the Capitalist A. F. of L." Such talk as this is pure bosh and utterly unworthy of a man who has shown himself capable of the scholarly work that Comrade Bohn has done in some of his writings. The fact of the thing is that nowhere is Socialism growing faster than within the unions connected with the A. F. of L. If this were not true then the industrial union would have stood little chance of success. To compare the leaders of the A. F. of L. to the leaders of the Democratic and Republican parties is also mere vituperative gymnastics. A man who goes into a pure and simple union goes in because economic conditions have forced him to do so. He goes in because he thinks he is fighting his boss and in a great majority of cases he is doing so, the existence of labor fakirs notwithstanding. The capitalist political party organization is formed to carry out certain purposes of the capitalist class in a wholly different field.

Some misunderstanding was possible with regard to my statement that there need be little change in the internal management of unions affiliated with the new organization. Yet even here there is no such transformation as Comrade Bohn talks about. Very many of the pure and simple unions provide for the initiative

referendum and certainly are more nearly controlled by their membership than the S. T. and L. A. Again, if it is true that the new union is to be less powerful on the economic field than the pure and simple unions but is simply to constitute a new Socialist political party jabbering a lot of jargon about general strikes and installing its officers as rulers of the co-operative commonwealth, then it is doomed to a short and sickening life.

A. M. SIMONS.

Evolution of the Theory of Evolution.

(Continued.)

WHILE Grecian philosophy had been climbing to the peaks of its greatness, Rome had been struggling for the control of the Italian peninsula. And now, when Ptolemy Philadelphus continued to build upon the foundations of literature, science, and art, laid by his talented predecessor in Egypt, Rome began its wars of expansion by a first onslaught upon Carthage. Always engaged in internal and external struggles, the rulers of Rome had been compelled to give more attention to the practical side of life than to the speculative. In the further development of the Roman world, internal class struggles and external wars of conquest continued to tax the resources of the Romans for the maintenance of the military power, and it was not until a much later time that a class of such wealth as that of classic Greece gave breathing space to literature and art.

At the time when Grecian philosophy found its patrons among the Ptolemies, the mental life of the Romans had not yet risen above the level of the Homeric stage of early Greece. And when Rome finally arrived at that period of its career where philosophy could become acclimatized in a Roman atmosphere, that is to say, about the middle of the century preceding the dawn of Christianity, Grecian philosophy completely dominated the ideas of all advanced thinkers. Moreover, this philosophy corresponded so fully to the requirements of the Roman empire, that it was simply adopted ready-made. But it was by no means improved upon. For the thinkers of Rome little understood the historical conditions out of which this philosophy had been evolved. The works of men like Lucretius and Cicero were either dreamy reflections of the scientific systems of their Grecian masters, or muddled by the instincts of the social class to which the philosophers of Rome belonged.

The Roman world never arrived at an independent philosophy. No sooner had the Roman emperors taken their seats, than they were called upon to put down rebellions at home and abroad, and to devote the resources of their empire to the maintenance of huge armies. Under these circumstances, science had to give precedence to epics and historical works. Philosophy lived on as a Grecian product. And in proportion as the Roman world disintegrated under the baneful effects of unprofitable slave labor and barbarian attacks, it created an environment in which the warrior survived over the thinker. The mental life of the masses,

which had at no time risen above the barbarian level, dragged along in this deep furrow, and the more the dissolution of the Roman empire proceeded, the farther did the intellectual pendulum swing back towards mysticism and idealism.

Philosophy as a science, in its garbled Ciceronian form, now withstood less than ever the pressure exerted against it by priestcraft and retrogressive obstinacy. Even in the East, where its cradle had been, and where its pulse had always been strongest, it gradually lost all attributes of science and was trampled under the heels of reaction. All pillars of mental evolution gave way, the Grecian and Roman gods lay prostrate, and the obscurity of previous historical stages settled down upon rich and poor alike.

Among the ruling classes, brutal cynicism and anarchist scepticism spread apace. Their education was just far enough advanced to enable them to sneer at heaven and hell. But the masses, untaught and superstitious, could not part with the consolation of mystical beliefs. Everything paved the way for the ascendancy of some new god who should be more powerful than any of the disavowed gods.

As soon as the historical stage had been set for the enactment of this new scene, the actors began to play their parts. Of all the religions then existing, none was better fitted to fulfill the requirements of this historical situation than the Jewish. It had clung steadfastly to its one god, ever since Abraham emigrated from Chaldea to avoid idolatry. It had withstood exile, war, and persecution. The Jewish god had but to be dressed up in a garb acceptable to all nationalities that now mingled in the Roman provinces and in Rome itself. And he needed but an international force that would raise him to the position of its chosen patron. This force was ready at hand. It was the proletariat, composed of freed slaves and impoverished freemen. An international language also existed. It was a mongrel Latin, with which everybody was more or less familiar.

There was a very good reason why this proletariat should rally to the support of some international religion. At various times, and at widely separated places, attempts had been made to overthrow the ruling classes by force of arms. These attempts met with the same fate that has since befallen all similar revolts which were undertaken before the conditions for their success had matured. They were drowned in seas of blood. And the most Draconic laws forbade any organization which was not officered by the overseers of the ruling classes. Political action was likewise out of the question, for the same reasons.

Religion was the only hope of the proletariat. It offered the only possibility of organization which the ruling class would not suppress, nay, which it would promote for the same reasons that rulers have ever had for preserving religion, viz., because

it is an excellent means of dividing the working classes and of strengthening belief in authority.

It was but logical, therefore, that this new religion should first appear in Palestine, and that it should try to justify itself from the ancient records, which had once been the common heritage of all members of the twelve tribes. The carpenter of Nazareth and his followers had but to step into the shoes of the ancient tribal prophets in order to get a hearing among the workers. The very arguments that once served in the mouths of the old prophets against the usurpation of the tribal chiefs, or kings, sounded familiar in the mouths of the new prophets when used against the rulers of Christ's time.

So the new paganism tried to drive out the devil by the help of Satan. Christianity entered history as the first conscious attempt of an international proletariat to hide its revolutionary aims under the cloak of a religion adapted to its mental requirements.

It spread like wildfire among the proletariat of the entire Roman empire, for the soil had been well prepared for it by the historical conditions. Christ is reported to have been crucified about the year 33. About thirty years later, Nero burned Rome in order to set loose the fury of the Roman plebs against the Christians, who were permeating the entire fabric of the Roman world. But religion is a double-edged sword and cannot be overcome by any persecutions. The Roman emperors had ample opportunity to learn this during the next 300 years. In spite of all persecutions, Christianity worked its way into the very heart of Roman society and into the remotest provinces. It thrived on persecution. At last the ruling class discovered that it had neglected its best weapon when it failed to identify itself with this new religious movement. Religion can be overcome only by two things: Either by another religion, or by science. But the ruling class had neither science nor any other religion to oppose to this new creed. In 312, six years after the advent of Constantine to the throne, matters had reached such a climax that there remained only one alternative to the ruling class: Either to succumb between the invading hordes of Goths, Franks, Allemanni, revolts in the provinces, and the Christian proletariat, or to divide and rule.

Naturally, Constantine grasped this last straw. Thanks to 300 years of evolution under the Roman constitution, which was but the political mirror of the then existing mode of production, economic distinctions and religious schisms had arisen among the Christians. The primitive communist practices had become distasteful to many Christians who had acquired property enough to feel more kin to the pagan rulers than to their proletarian brethren. Under the influence of their material interests, these wealthy Christians were only too prone to enter into a protective

alliance with the pagan powers against the proletariat of any and all creeds. The rulers, on the other hand, had reached the stage, where their only safety lay in the domination of the Christian movement by the help of the wealthy Christians. Under these circumstances, we see here a phenomenon, which became quite common later on, and which we noticed once before in Greece: When scepticism, or materialism, became useless for the ruling class, and a hitherto persecuted philosophy or religion useful, the rulers changed their religion as easily as if it were a shirt. The same tendency is once more apparent in our own time, where formerly protestant or atheist rulers are showing an ever more pronounced willingness to enter the fold of the catholic church in exchange for the services of this church against the rising revolution of the modern proletariat.

Whenever the rulers are ready for this step, some great miracle happens. About 1,600 years before Constantine, Moses had suddenly seen a great light in the bush. He saw it several times later, when new property relations demanded imperatively a transformation of the persistent tribal customs into "laws" more in keeping with the interests of the hierarchy. He had not been in close touch with the Egyptian princes and their priestcraft without learning from them. Now it was Constantine's turn to see a great light. Saul had seen the same thing before he became Paul, only for a different purpose. The new Saul became, not a Paul, but a Judas, and the Judases in the Christian movement were lavishly rewarded by him with grants of land and money. The farce was inscribed "*In hoc signo vinces*," and presto, the Christian religion became the church of the ruling class. The Christian proletariat had played with fire and got burned. But it was the best they could do under the prevailing historical conditions. They repeated the same mistake many times after, and they will repeat it, until they learn to use a weapon which no ruling class can wrest from their hands,—proletarian science.

In vain did the proletariat strive to overcome ruling class religion by proletarian religion. No sooner did the ruling class make the Christian religion its own, than its struggling parties took sides in the religious schisms of the Christians, and used them as means for their own dynastic ends. The adoption of the Nicene creed at the council of Nicaea in 325, and the condemnation of Arius who opposed the mystical additions of Athanasius to the primitive Christian creed, marked the complete control of the church organization by the ruling class. And when Julian the Apostate championed the Arian creed in the attempt to hold his position against the intrigues of the Athanasian diplomats, he made the same experience which the Christian proletariat had made before him. In a mystic religion, mysticism always

holds the best trumps. The council at Constantinople, in 381, marked another step in the direction of mysticism, and in the following struggles for and against image worship, it was again the reactionary tendencies which won the day.

We need not get into the details of the evolution of Christianity at this stage. Suffice it to say that henceforth it was lost to the proletariat as a weapon in its struggles against the ruling classes, and has ever since proven itself a bulwark of retrogressive counter-revolutions. Science was tied hand and foot. The strictest regulations were issued, forbidding practices which were then almost the only means of inductive research, such as the anatomical study of human corpses. This was still vetoed by the church in the 15th century. In ancient Greece, natural philosophy owed most of its inductive facts to physicians. Under the rule of the Roman Christians, physicians were practically compelled to take up metaphysics, if they cared at all for philosophical research. Science fell almost entirely into the hands of the priests. It was but natural, that Platonic-Aristotelean philosophy should become the favorite of these religious thinkers, and that under their influence, astronomy should assume the form of astrology, and chemistry that of alchemy.

Nor were economic and political conditions favorable to the inductive modes of scientific research. In the first place, the Huns began their westward and southward march in 374, two years after Ulfila had translated the Bible into Gothic. And in 410, five years after the completion of the VULGATE by Jerome, the Visigoths pillaged Rome. The Huns were beaten on the Catalaunian fields in 451, but in 455, the Vandals paid a visit to Rome. The struggle between the East-Roman and West-Roman empires, the continued invasions of barbarians from the North, of the Arabs from the East, kept Europe in a state of restless ferment. And this condition of things continued from century to century, so long as feudalism, the successor of Roman slavery, endured. Later we have the Moors in the South, the Turks in the East, the Norsemen in the North; the crusades, beginning in 1,095; the raids made in the interest of the Mediterranean merchant towns against the Turks. All these disturbances discouraged education at the expense of warrior's virtues. Even late in the middle ages, most of the "noble" heroes were content to leave the despised art of letters to monks and physically weak bookworms.

• On the economic field, production lagged along in its feudal slowness, without stimulating the invention of labor-saving machinery, of improved methods of cultivation, or of scientific instruments and processes. Alchemy and astrology occasionally stumbled across some great discovery, but did not know what to do with it when they found it. The stone of the wise, the elixir

of life, the making of gold by laboratory methods, the idea that phlogiston, or fire-air, was the cause of fire, these and similar things mark the scientific methods on which the philosophy of the middle ages based its speculations, which never dared to deviate very far from the religious dogma.

Communication and travel were very difficult and dangerous. Marco Polo, in 1271, was the first great traveler who sought to popularize the results of his travels. Enlightenment inevitably took a religious disguise, as before. This is evident, for instance, in the anti-papal movement of Arnold of Brescia in the middle of the 12th century, and in the struggle of the humanists against the obscurantists in the 15th and 16th centuries. But whatever may have been discovered by inductive methods in the secrecy of the investigator's cell, the outside world never heard about it. Excommunication, the stake, the dungeon, poison and dagger, were always held in readiness by the rulers, and their spiritual advisers, for any daring thinker who might have ventured forth with any startling discovery in natural science. The horrors of bloodshed on every hand were intensified by the burning of "heretics," and to make the terror complete, the "Black Plague" swept across Europe about the middle of the 14th century.

But evolution, though denied official recognition, went its fateful way. Very soon, the church itself felt the giant hand of social progress clutching at its heart.

The church, instead of building its foundation on the Rock of Ages, had built on a far less "eternal" ground, viz., on the exploitation of feudal serfs. Now this foundation had been gradually undermined since the 13th century. More than once, the feudal serfs had stirred restlessly under the heavy yoke of the feudal church. In Great Britain, they had rallied around John Ball and Wat Tyler, about the last quarter of the 14th century, and threatened the rule of the church. On the continent, the wars against the Turks had kept the class struggle more under cover. But along with the decline of the worldly power of the church, there had come a mighty growth of commercial cities. These had taken part in the movements against the oriental rulers who were cutting western commerce off from the resources of India and Persia. Since the 11th century, the Mediterranean cities had tried to capture the eastern ports, such as Alexandria, Jaffa, Tyre, Constantinople, and to control the land routes to India across Asia Minor. But the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 settled the question of the control of these ports and routes in favor of the Turks.

Cut off from the land route to the East, the trading class naturally turned their thoughts to the open sea in the West. The religious fervor of the crusades had gradually given way to

frankly avowed commercial considerations, and in the last crusades, it had not been so much a question of saving the "Holy Sepulchre," as of amassing wealth. And when the possibility of gathering spoils had vanished beyond recall, the desire to keep the grave of Christ in the care of Christian hands had lost its dearest incentive.

But an outlet had to be found for the irrepressible longing to expand which filled the breast of the trading class. It had gradually dawned on the thinkers of Europe, that this globe was a good deal larger than the Ptolemaic system supposed. The travels of Marco Polo, made possible by the unification of Eastern Asia under the rule of Genghis Khan, had revived the ancient wonder-tales which the conquests of Alexander the Great had carried back into the Western world. The invasions of the Huns had reminded Europe forcibly of the fact that there was a vast territory of unknown extent beyond the generally accepted boundaries of the globe, and the temporary control of Eastern ports in the Mediterranean and Black Sea, together with the establishment of advanced trading posts in Asia Minor, had given a substantial basis to the idea that the Eastern world contained fabulous riches. Besides, even in ancient times, the Ptolemaic system had not been accepted by all thinkers as correct. Now the doubts as to its correctness grew still more.

The improvement of shipbuilding had even before this time permitted daring navigators to venture out into the unknown seas of the West. And when it became a vital necessity for the trading class to get in touch with the East by some hitherto untried route, it was not long before exploring trips were undertaken. It is true, no scientific proofs of the unsoundness of the Ptolemaic system had as yet been produced. But the practical navigators did not wait for the theoretical proofs of its unsoundness. On a southward trip made by Bartolomeo Dias in the years 1486 and 1487, the Cape of Good Hope was discovered and the map of the world considerably extended. On October 12, 1492, Columbus landed on San Salvador, Bahama Islands. In 1497, John Cabot discovered the mainland of North America. The year after that, Sebastian Cabot went in search of a Northwest passage to China, and Vasco de Gama landed in India after a successful trip around the Cape of Good Hope. In 1499, Ojeda and Vespucci sailed along the east coast of South America.

The earth had suddenly grown to twice its former size. Columbus had made good his claim that it was a round globe, not flat. The discoveries of other navigators clinched his proof. While the wise men were still debating this stupendous revolution of their ideas, the trading class vigorously pushed forward into the newly discovered territory and began to gather untold wealth. The church winked its eye and pocketed its share. Al-

though these discoveries were the entering wedge which split open the entire dogmatic world-conception, the church did not think of condemning the daring navigators as heretics. Their heresy paid well. Besides, these explorations offered a great field for the expenditure of more religious fanaticism in a new direction. There were new nations to convert by fire and sword, and they were not so hard to "convince" as the Turks, because they could only argue with primitive weapons against the improved arms of the Europeans, who, thanks to Berthold Schwarz, could now lend emphasis to their religious propaganda by the help of gunpowder.

In 1513, Balboa saw the Pacific Ocean from the Isthmus of Panama. In 1520, Magellan sailed through the straits between Tierra del Fuego and Patagonia which henceforth bore his name; in 1521 he reached the Ladrões, and Cortes conquered Mexico. And in 1531-33, Pizarro looted Peru. At the same time, the Turks pushed westward and threatened Vienna.

Every one of these historical events was a nail in the coffin of ecclesiastical feudalism, and the church, being the greatest feudal lord, helped to drive those nails by making itself a party to these looting expeditions, and covering them with the cloak of missionary work.

The mental reaction of these discoveries on philosophy and astronomy followed immediately. In the same year in which Sebastian Cabot set out on his trip across the North Atlantic, Savonarola was killed for his opposition to the church. While Columbus was making his second and third trip to the West Indies, Luther was girding his loins against Rome, and three years before the discovery of the Straits of Magellan, he nailed his theses on the church door in Wittenberg. One year after the conquest of Peru, England threw off the papal yoke, the Anabaptists assembled in Munster, and Luther completed his translation of the Bible. While the foundations of Lima and Buenos Ayres were being laid in South America, the first copies of the translated Bible were on the press, thanks to the invention of printing by Gutenberg, in 1438. The first enemy of orthodox religion, a new religion, had arisen.

Science, the second and more dangerous enemy of orthodoxy, was not slow in following. In 1473, Copernicus had been born. Before De Soto had reached the Mississippi river, Copernicus had completed his life's work, and on his dying day, in the year 1543, he received the first copy of his great work "*De Revolutionibus Orbium Celestium*" (The Revolution of Celestial Bodies). In order to understand the powerful impression made by this work, we must fully enter into the spirit of those times. For centuries it had been a gospel truth that the earth stood still, that it was the center of the universe, that the sun, moon, and

stars revolved around it from East to West. Now this daring astronomer claimed that the earth was moving around itself from West to East, and around the sun in a wide orbit, and that the sun was the center of its planetary system. That was contrary to all the established teachings of the dogmatic scientists, it was opposed to the revealed "truths" of the Bible, it was heresy. *Anathema sit!*

But the time was approaching, when the anathema of the church did not stop the wheels of scientific progress any more. The cities needed the help of science and protected their scientific explorers. In 1616, Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood, a new step toward an experimental philosophy. When the pilgrims were landing in Plymouth, in 1620, Galileo Galilei and John Kepler were engaged in further undermining dogmatic ignorance by their revolutionary work. Galilei is the founder of experimental physics. He gave a scientific foundation to the theory of gravity, invented the pendulum, a hydrostatic balance, a thermometer, compasses used in designing, and a telescope. In 1610, he for the first time observed the satellites of the planet Jupiter. In 1632, he published his main work, "Four Dialogues on the Ptolemaic and Copernican World Systems."

Perhaps the church would not have cared so much about these scientific revolts against its established ideas of the world, had they remained mere academic discussions. For after all, none of them touched the foundation of the spiritual beliefs of the dogmatic religion, and it would have been easy enough to adjust the spiritual creed to this new science, without losing control of the minds of the masses who believed in the spiritual basis of the church. Even the ideas of Luther might have been tolerated, had they preserved a mere scholastic existence. They were no more dangerous than had been many other religious heresies before that time.

As a matter of fact, though Galilei was tried for heresy on account of the above work, he was treated without harshness, and even his obstinate "*E pur si muove*" (And yet it moves), uttered immediately after the revocation of his theories, did not result in any increased penalty for him. Luther might also have escaped with no more severe penalties than Galilei, had it been merely a question of a religious controversy.

But the class-struggle seized upon both religion and science, just as it had done before, and as it will continue to do so long as class antagonisms exist. To the extent that the merchant class grew in wealth and power, it did not only protect the new world-conception, but also began to question the right of the church to collect taxes and to mismanage church-property. And the ideas of religious reformers became at once the rallying center of bands of revolting peasants and improverished nobles, who threatened

the holdings of the church in land and movable wealth. This outraged and hurt the hierarchy more than all attacks on established articles of faith and philosophy.

For this reason, it became a matter of self-defence for the Roman church to call reactionary science, religious fanaticism, and the entire apparatus of its organization to its assistance against the new and startling evolution of things and ideas. So Tycho de Brahe entered the arena to defend the Ptolemaic system against Galilei and Kepler. Tetzlaff defended the right of the church to levy taxes. Luther was challenged to defend his ideas at Worms. And the feudal rulers were instigated to gather their armed forces and make war on the burghers and peasants. The Reformation with its economic and mental revolution struck deep into the flesh of the church, and paved the way for the subsequent freedom of scientific investigation which accumulated in the course of the following centuries the basic facts for a consistent theory of evolution.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

(To be Continued.)

Scientific Socialism and the American Working Class.

THE capitalist form of society of all countries has reached its highest development in the United States. From this the following conclusions are logical:

1. Gradual decay of capitalist institutions: political and others.
2. Strong and growing class antagonism.

These two deductions form a basis, from which can be explained most of the contradictions or phenomena of capitalism. Before going into a detailed explanation of the phenomena let us agree that class antagonism does not necessarily mean class-consciousness. The latter is not a direct development of evolution in industry but a result of intellectual progress and must be taught, if it is to exist and grow.

The present workingclass movement outside and inside the trade-unions does not teach classconsciousness, because it lacks the knowledge which springs from the understanding of the principles of scientific socialism. Class-instinct is a vague and senseless term; classconsciousness the very opposite.

All immediate demands of the workingclass are antagonistic to all other classes: plutocracy, middlemen, farmers. If they are expressed and fought out on the political field they cannot win nor get the slightest attention, because on that battleground the workingclass even if united is the weakest. A political movement of the proletariat based on immediate reforms contributes nothing towards its education and will result disastrously, because its ultimate failure will suggest an improper alliance with some other class.

It is on the industrial field and on that only where the proletariat will win some needed reforms such as shorter hours, higher wages, abolition of child-labor and so on. There labor meets the exploiter directly and every day in the year. At the source of exploitation the proletariat is less subject to the corrupting influence of the politician and misleader, because the results of corruption are apparent immediately. The daily intercourse with fellow laborers furnishes the basis for the strongest kind of organization and for the development of classconsciousness.

Twenty years ago the middle class had some influence in politics. Then reforms were possible. Today the Socialist Party by capturing city governments can do no more than aid in educating the workingclass. Today the socialists can use the

ballot only for the purpose of a social revolution. To be fit as instruments of the revolution the working people's standard of living must be raised *during capitalism* and the beginning of such efforts must be made at once.

But political reforms are impractical and become more so during the further development of capitalism. Public ownership may or may not appear before socialism, but in either case the capitalists will be the only factors; the proletariat will be indifferent. An income tax may be practical in Germany where capitalism must share governmental powers with feudalism under conditions which permit but little of that corruption, which exists in the United States.

But the socialist movement in Germany or any other country is qualitatively weak in comparison to the American movement. On the one hand political action of the working-class is the means for the abolition of capitalism. On the other hand the industrial movement contains the germ of new society, and is the means of establishing the cooperative commonwealth.

The first is the basis for the destruction of capitalism; the idea growing gradual, but the action itself must be instantaneous.

The second is the basis for the gradual betterment of workingclass conditions in spite of and during capitalism, and for the final reconstruction of society.

The "modern, utopian" may call himself a "scientific socialist" and use the word "revolution" indiscriminately. He will get little attention. The "critic" of the modern utopian may think that it is a good move to flatter with and connive at the mistaken political notions of the average workingman. But he will not be listened to by the workingmen of more than average intelligence. The latter know that their fellow workers cannot become *classconscious*, if their ignorant whims are gratified; they must be educated in spite of opposition coming from their ranks.

Let us hail with joy the new industrial organization of the working-class. It alone will better conditions of the working-class during capitalist regime and the reflex of those better conditions will be a higher standard of ethics and morals amongst the workingmen. It will develop class-consciousness, which will unite the workingclass and drive it to the ballot box, where capitalism then will receive its deathblow.

And it will have prepared for years the basic foundation for the new structure: the glorious socialist republic. M. D.

Socialism and the Farmers.

The belief is steadily growing that *Regard for the Collective Welfare of the People is the Highest Law*. The capitalist exploiter of labor, even, must, within his own consciousness, assent to this at times when his sense of benevolence and justice pit themselves against his acquisitiveness and greed for private gain.

If this principle, then, regard for the greatest collective good, be applied even under capitalism (the defense of capitalism not in mind) to the ownership and operation of a city's water supply, lighting, street railways and other municipal utilities, the logical situation becomes this:—

If the community, as such, cannot own and operate its public utilities for the greater good of the community, and the individual can do it, it is then best to give the individual the privilege for a limited time to do it with due compensation to himself. This is now done in most cities (the public unfortunately doubting its own better ability) by granting a franchise for a fixed period, but no city would think of giving a perpetual franchise; for, when the time comes that the community can own and operate its utilities to their greater advantage than the individual can or will, the community then owes it to itself to do it, (and this time has arrived for most cities) and the individual owner and operator owes it to the community that he retire, in order that the greater good may accrue to the community. To refuse to then retire, rightful compensation for his interests being offered, is to be selfish to the detriment of the public.

This same principle applies also to the ownership and use of land under capitalism. The farmer who owns land and uses it to a better purpose for himself and the community than it would be made to serve if owned and operated by the community, he, the farmer, and owner of it, should be protected in his private ownership. But, if through changed conditions, the public good ("public" being understood in its broadest sense) can be best served by the public owning and operating all land, and this time is fast approaching, then private ownership of land is, of course, detrimental to the public good and should cease. This principle of utilitarianism is often carried into effect even under capitalism, in appropriating land for parks and other purposes. Socialism would extend this principle to the collective ownership of all public utilities and productive property, to the absolute abolishment of unjust exploitation of labor, to which capitalism and private ownership have given rise.

OBJECTION TO PERPETUAL PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF LAND.

That it has, *in the past in this country*, been for the public good, as well as for private welfare, to have land privately owned in sufficient amounts for farm purposes, and the home thus established, is evident, and many people have come to own parcels of it. This would no doubt be done, too, under socialism, to the extent at least of owning privately a home spot, but not to the extent of becoming an exploiter of labor on it.

But a few people, through greed in some cases, have got a thousand times more land than they can use, or is required to supply their needs, while others equally deserving have to do without any. This often turns out, in view of monopolies of land, and because of its deposits and products, not to be for the public welfare. and, therefore, the private owner's claim to this excess of land is not a righteous claim if the higher principle of law is kept in mind,—the collective good of the people. That which is right, under certain conditions will always be right under the same conditions. But, under changed conditions, it often becomes a wrong. This explains why a policy which placed large tracts of land in private ownership has proved a hardship later, while at first it may have been a good. When the great western plains were virgin, no white men living there, they were of no value to civilization on the Atlantic Coast. The west could only be used as the people of the east went west and settled it. To encourage this was right. To encourage it the Government gave the land away in quarter sections and in larger lots to him who would go west and use it. Millions of acres were given to a few individuals incorporated. It was given to these persons to be their property, and that of their heirs, forever, and here it was that the mistake was made, because *forever* is long enough for conditions to become so changed as to make that which was right then, a wrong later. To have given it to the honest, first settlers and corporations for a limited time (certainly to the settlers for their life time, and, perhaps, for the lifetime of their children) would have been right. That would have secured settlers, but to give it away *forever* was short-sighted.*

Why? Because it would inevitably lead in the end to a land owning and non-land owning class, both equally in need of land, for, as population increased and more and more land was taken up, population increasing, the time must come, whether land be obtained by gift or purchase, that it would all be taken up and

*NOTE. Justice William J. Gaynor, of the New York Supreme Court, said recently in an interview on railroads,—“If the possibility of this experience we have had with freight rates had been foreseen, the government never would have given these highways to corporations.” This gift was accompanied with the gift of more than 150,000,000 acres of land.

owned privately; owned by those whose title-papers made the land theirs *forever*, absolutely theirs; while the non-owning class, which is now still larger by increasing population, though in equal need of land do not possess it, and by force of circumstances cannot possess it, because those who own it, whether by gift from the Government or small purchase price, or by inheritance, own it *forever*. Many of them, too, owning it without using it, but simply holding it for profits, and acting the dog in the manger, while millions who need it, but cannot buy it, suffer for the lack of it, though it lies unused about them.

The fact that the original takers of land usually part with it, and others get it, does not effect the question, for these others get PERPETUAL titles, and it is this in the hands of any private owner that is wrong.

This situation (more and more non-owners) grows constantly worse as population increases, and nothing but Socialism promises to prevent the steady increase of the non-owning and dependent class.

Say what we will, there are two classes in this "Land of Liberty"—the small possessing class and the large non-possessing class—and their distinction grows clearer every year. One per cent of the people of the United States are said to own more wealth than all the remaining 99 per cent of the people put together. This situation as to land (and from land we all draw our sustenance) would not have been as it is, had the original claims to land been given for a limited time and the land at the end of that time to have reverted to the government for re-distribution among the people in a way to serve the needs of all the people instead of a part as now.

When our nation is in war it gathers up raw recruits and sends them, company after company, to a drill camp for discipline before they are sent to the front to fight. Suppose the first company to get there, after the tents and mess house, the water supply and drill grounds had been prepared, should say to the second company, when it comes in: This camp belongs to us. We got here first. It is ours forever, if the war lasts that long. You arrived too late to get possession. You can use the camp only as you buy it of us or pay us rent. The second company replies that it is the purpose of the government that the camp be used by all companies sent there. But to this the reply comes back—We possessed it first. It is ours and not yours. What would happen? There would be war, sure.

Life is a war, a struggle for existence, and raw recruits are born at the rate of more than one per second. As they approach the active stage of life they find others in actual possession of the things which they must use to earn a living, and who say to them, as the first company to the second, it is ours and not yours.

You came too late. And thus the latter becomes wage slaves of the master class.

The government, though it perhaps intended to protect and help all, has actually thwarted its own ends by giving perpetual private ownership to land. Socialists would again make land public property to serve the needs of all.

The people in doing this would probably favor the *gradual* relinquishment of private ownership of land, as it was favored by Lincoln to gradually liberate the slaves, and of the unused land held for speculation first, letting it as rapidly as relinquished revert to the government, thus making it again the property of the whole people, as our lakes and rivers are, and to be used for the most part co-operatively.

THE TWO LEADING QUESTIONS.

Two questions arise here, viz: How will the land, as it becomes owned by the people—the government—be parcelled out or brought under collective use; and, How will the present private owners be persuaded to relinquish claim?

In answering this, the great Socialistic principle to hold to is this: That the whole people should own the productive property of the nation, and the resources on which all depend for life and comfort and give each worker access to them to earn a living by any honest labor of hand or brain, and to each worker the full product or equivalent of his toil.

Land, then, as it gradually becomes owned by the government, will be brought under use by giving to all who want land for actual productive purposes, the right, not to perpetually possess, but the right to use land co-operatively, or possibly privately, so long as they use it for the best interest of themselves and the public.

Will this cause the little farmer to cease to own his land? Yes, and No. Yes, if not for other reasons, because he would probably desire it. No, probably not during his lifetime, if he should not wish it: for the government on the inauguration of Socialism will likely still have enough arid and bottom land with the unused relinquished lands to give land for use purposes to those who want it.

It seems likely that the privately owned and operated farms will be the last things Socialized, and the generation of small farmers in possession of farms at the time Socialism is inaugurated may be allowed to retain their farms for their lifetime, if they choose to, which they will probably not want to do, because co-operative farming will be more desirable and they will wish to enter it, resigning ownership as they do so, but remaining on their same old farms, and being actually given more land,

to use if they need it, but not to own. Many farmers will no doubt be persuaded of this advantage of Socialism and will themselves vote for its inauguration.

In this way, then, by choice and not otherwise, it is likely that the little farmers will relinquish private ownership of their farms for the greater advantage to them of collective ownership and operation.

ADVANTAGES TO THE LITTLE FARMER.

What would these advantages be?

1. The right to the use of as much land as is needed for the individual and public good.

2. No mortgages, as now, with the danger of losing the mortgaged farm, and not obtaining another except as the farmer buys it or rents and gives the owner one-half of his product.

3. Under Socialism no exploitation by the railroads, the beef, the implement, elevator and other trusts, but the full product or equivalent of the farmer's labor would be his, except the small part which he, with all workers, will contribute for the support of the co-operative government and the dependent ones. This we give now and it must be done under any government. Under Socialism these expenses should be much less than now.

4. Socialized farming would admit of such improved methods and machinery as compared with private agriculture that the former would be desirable because of shorter hours of labor with greater products and a larger, more free and better life.

Socialism, then, in these ways, and by making the farmer a sharer in the whole industrial life of the nation, would help and not harm the little farmer, though he may cease in time to privately own his farm, except a home spot which he might earn and own, but no large tract of land on which to become an exploiter of his brother laborer.

SOCIALISM AND THE LARGE LAND OWNER.

But how of the large land holder? He, too, in the end, by relinquishing claim to an excess of land, will be happier and better off, by having those around him better off. Society is a social organism, and that which helps or harms one individual or group of individuals, helps or harms the whole.

The large land holder, who, on the inauguration of Socialism, owns land and does not use it, or who uses it to enrich himself by the labor of others, will be persuaded to part with his excess of land probably at once, for the benefit of the non-possessors of land who want land to cultivate. One potent reason why he will part with it will be, because he will be unable to get men to work it for him and be exploited by wages, or on shares, for Socialism

is a protest against human exploitation. But the farmer who owns only enough land from which to produce a living, and such a good living as every man is entitled to enjoy, is not an exploiter, and, to that extent, it is not impossible that land may be privately owned under Socialism. But this private ownership and operation would naturally be abandoned, as already stated, if co-operative farming proved more inviting.

Would the large land holders be paid for the land they disgorge? The single taxer would practically confiscate it; gradually, of course, by high taxation, as the United States Government did the State Banks during the Civil War, by the ten per cent tax it imposed upon them. Socialism could do no worse than confiscate it—but might pay the owners the first cost of the land plus the improvements on it.

What really will be done will be that which the majority of the people vote to have done (hence we need cross no bridge until we reach it), for this is a country where the majority will rule, and their sense of justice usually guides them, sometimes slowly, sometimes quickly and with irresistible impetus, to righteous ends. We have the power to change old forms of government, and the people will do it, not only to the extent of changing the Constitution, but to the abolishment of private ownership of productive property (the railways, mines, and oil fields first) when such old forms by changed environments become unsuited to advancing civilization and work hardships to the people sufficient to arouse them to see the need of change. If they would not then change the obsolete for the new and better, they would be untrue to themselves, to the cause of human progress and to the spirit of the constitution. It is well to bear in mind, too, that revolutions become bloody only when the small master class oppose the progress of the mass of the people, as in Russia to-day, to higher and better planes of life. We would not be content, however, if Socialism was a thing of coercion. Unlike that, it invites and attracts to itself when it is understood. For, it will plenty and love, like that for which Christ prayed, "In earth as more than anything else usher in an era radiant with joy, peace, it is in Heaven."

C. F. DIGHT, M. D.,

Professor of Physiology in Medical Dept. Hamline University.

The Revolutionary Movement in Russia.

The eyes of the civilized world are turned toward Russia.

In Russia we witness at present the throbbing of the pulse of history.

Russia occupies now the position of France at the inception of the Great Revolution.

For centuries the best sons and daughters of Russia had to look upon freedom and civilization as unattainable dreams.

The iron grip of despotism deadened the soul of the people. Supported by millions of slaves, soiled by the blood of subjugated nations the government of the Czars attained hegemony among nations.

The government of the Czars used its tremendous influence in the interests of Darkness and Strife, Reaction and Militarism.

The press was muzzled by a strict and stupid censorship.

Science was chained by barbaric police regulations.

The ancient liberties of Poland, the Baltic provinces and Finland were trampled down with ruthless barbarity and bestial cruelty.

The non-Slavonic, non-orthodox-Greek elements of the population were persecuted with unparalleled severity.

The cries of agony and despair of the victims of the massacre of Kishineff are still fresh in our memory.

The atrocities and crimes perpetrated by the Russian government reached their climax in the now historical massacre on the 9th (22d) of January, 1905 on the streets of St. Petersburg. The long suffering Russian people finally lost their stoic patience and revolted, provoked by the stupid and cruel action of the Czar and his minions.

A peaceful deputation of working men decided to present their grievances directly to their "little father."

They assured the Czar of their peaceful intentions and prepared four hundred able bodied men to protect his personal safety.

The "little father" heroically retired behind the thick walls of his palace and has sent his Hessians and Janissars to assassinate his "little children" on the streets of the capital. The cowards, who run at the very sight of Japanese soldiers, reddened the snow of St. Petersburg with blood of defenseless citizens, women and children.

The civilized world shuddered when it heard of this unprecedented crime.

The blood of the martyrs of the 22d of January sealed the doom of Russian absolutism.

The plain Russian people in its touching naivete believed in the personal benevolence of the Czar.

The massacre of the 22d of January rudely crushed this belief.

The excommunication of the leader of the peaceful deputation, of Father Gapon, by the Holy Synod, convinced the people that the State church of Russia is but a handmaid of despotism. Events moved rapidly since then.

The vacillating, headless policy of the Czar, made him and his government contemptible and ridiculous.

The conduct of the revolutionary masses gained the admiration of the world.

Who is responsible for the internal and external policy of the Czar?

Who represents the power behind the throne?

Who represents the opposition forces in Russia?

Where does this opposition come from?

These are the questions that naturally force themselves upon us.

The popular conception is that the Czar of Russia is the sole ruler of the Empire, that his personal will is law. A moment of reflection will convince us that this popular conception is an absurdity.

Indeed, no single man, even if he be a giant, can possibly rule one hundred and seventy millions of people, living under various climatic, economic and cultural conditions, scattered over a vast area of land and belonging to different ethnic groups.

And Nicholas the Second is a physical, mental and moral dwarf.

The actual power behind the throne, the real ruler of Russia, is not the Czar, but the "Chinovniks," the class of officials, the bureaucracy.

When Peter I. to use Johannes Scherrs' apt expression, "knouted Russia into Europe" he needed assistants in his tremendous undertaking.

He picked out a few young men of the nobility and has had to send them to Europe to learn how to run the affairs of the State.

After their return, these young men were entrusted with the execution of the plans of the Czar.

According to the tendency of each and every ruling class the bureaucrats increased in numbers and acquired more and more power and influence in the State.

The dense ignorance of the masses, the indifference of the classes and the incapacity of the Czars were rather favorable to

the numerical growth of the ruling class and increase of its power.

Despotism and bureaucracy always supplement each other. This way an irresponsible and corrupt ruling class was formed behind the shaky throne of the Czars and the worm-eaten altar of the State-Church.

This class at the same time dictated and executed the internal policy of the empire in the interests of this class.

It was in the interests of that class to inaugurate a policy of adventurous expansion and force a disastrous war in the Far East.

It was in the interests of this class to keep the people in the darkness of ignorance and superstition.

It was in the interests of this class to forcibly Russianise Poland, the Baltic provinces and Finland.

It was in the interests of this class to persecute Poles, Germans, Finns and Jews.

New territories and provinces open new fields of pernicious activity for the ever increasing numbers of hungry and greedy officials.

The same applies to "Russianised" provinces.

A war with Japan was necessary to the bureaucracy of Russia in order to divert the attention of the people from internal affairs. Beside this a war always offers too many chances for building railroads and bridges on paper, furnishing supplies on paper, constructing fleets on paper and other exploits of similar patriotic nature.

The bureaucrats are not afraid of the peasant with medieval ideas.

But the growing middle and working classes consisting of Germans, Poles, Finns and Jews appear to the ruling class as a constant menace, a *memento mori*. Hence their persecution by the government.

Let us now analyze the revolutionary elements in Russia.

The disastrous Crimean War convinced the Russian government, that it is necessary to modernize Russia, i. e. build railroads, start factories, etc.

However, in order to build railroads, start and run factories, free labor was a condition *sine qua non*.

As long as serfdom existed there was no room for the growth and development of a city proletariat.

Serfdom was therefore abolished almost at the same time and for similar reasons as slavery was abolished in the United States of America.

The abolition of Serfdom in Russia was as far reaching in its results in Russia as the abolition of Slavery in the United States.

The quality and quantity of the allotments of land to the liber-

ated serfs were of just such a nature as to be too little to live upon and too much to die of starvation.

A nucleus of a city-proletariat was formed. Railroads could be built, factories operated.

Another far reaching result of the emancipation of the peasant was the creation of a class of intellectual proletarians.

In Western Europe and the United States of America the capitalists and merchants employ the intellectual proletarians in their factories and offices as clerks, business managers, salesmen, draftsmen, captains of industry, etc., etc.

This explains the fact, that the intellectual proletariat of Western Europe and America is rather conservative if not reactionary in his tendencies. He is as yet not conscious of his class-interests as the upper crust of the proletarian masses.

In Russia there were no industrial enterprises worth speaking of, no commerce of any importance.

The Russian intellectual proletariat was not provided even with the crumbs falling from the overladen table of the capitalists, as were their more fortunate brothers in the West.

The Russian intellectual proletariat had nothing to lose in the old regime but its chains and a world to gain in a Free Russia.

Hence the intellectual Russian proletariat was revolutionary by its very nature from its inception.

The antiquated state institutions of Russia were beyond any reform, hence the radical tendencies of the intellectuals prevailed. The ideas and ideals of the Russian intellectual proletariat were those of contemporary Utopian Socialism of Western Europe. The intellectuals felt their own weakness as a class and decided to win the broad masses of the people, i. e. peasants.

The intellectuals started a "movement into the people," in order to preach the gospel of brotherly love and cooperation.

It was a strictly non-political, but rather educational movement similar to, although not identical with, the university settlement movement in the United States.

Young men and women of the higher ability went "into the people" to lead a simple, laborious life full of privations, dangers and disappointments in order to do missionary work among the peasants.

The movement "into the people" was one of the most arduous and generous ever recorded on the pages of history.

But, alas, it was the most hopeless, the most barren of results.

The patriarchal village commune, serfdom and czardom closed the mind of the peasant to the ideals of Utopian socialism developed in industrial countries with more or less free political institutions. Serfdom created an abyss between the peasants and other classes in Russia. In their touching simplicity of mind, they looked upon each and every non-peasant as upon an enemy.

The generous crusade of the early propagandists of the new gospel was met with suspicion on the part of the peasants, who turned a deaf ear to the noble missionaries.

There are many cases on record when peasants turned over these noble missionaries to the police.

The movement "into the people" would probably run its own course and end in bitter disenchantment for the propagandists if left to its own fate.

However, the stupid and cowardly government was scared out of its wits by the educational activity of high minded Utopian enthusiasts. The Russian government felt alarmed and started an era of cruel persecution. The peaceful propagandists were treated more severely than common criminals. The propagandists were imprisoned for life, banished to Siberia, executed on the gallows.

The "white" terror of the White Czar called forth the "red" terror of the revolutionists.

Secret societies with terroristic proclivities sprang up like mushrooms all over the country and an uneven, heroic struggle between intellectual proletarians and the government of the Czar, a struggle between David and Goliath was started.

The most typical secret terroristic society was represented by the so-called "Party of the Peoples Will," ruled by the famous "Executive Committee."

The "Executive Committee" was more dreaded by the Czars, than the day of judgment. Since the appearance of white and red terrorism—the Russian government deserved the title of a "Despotism tempered by assassination."

The activity of the "Executive Committee" culminated in the execution of Alexander II.

With this unfortunate prince, red terrorism expired.

Terrorism was discredited. It removed personalities, but left the conditions producing them unchanged. It produced reaction.

The reign of Alexander III, this poor imitator of Nicholas I, and Nicholas II, the degenerate scion of the dynasty of Romanoff's, was reactionary in the extreme.

Meanwhile the disintegration of the village-commune and proletarianisation of the people were progressing rapidly. Industries developed and the working class counts at present about five million of men and women.

Russia was modernized economically.

The process of political modernization must follow as day must follow night.

Although comparatively small in numbers, the city-proletariat formed the dynamic element of the Russian population. A party that would be shrewd enough to see it and gain the control of the

working-class must by the very nature of things possess the key to the political situation in Russia.

The party is the party of the working class, the Social-Democratic party.

The Russian Social-Democratic party possesses the full confidence of the working class and dictates its policy.

The Russian Social-Democratic Party stands on the broad principles of International Socialism.

It believes, that the emancipation of the broad masses of the Russian people has to be effected by its advanced guard, the working class.

It believes that the mission of intellectuals must be limited to guidance and direction of the revolutionized but not sufficiently class conscious masses of the people.

It knows that the soil of Freedom was always fertilized by the blood of martyrs and tyrants and believes therefore in the terrorism of the masses.

Social-Democrats know that the Nemesis of history will produce a Brutus to every Caesar.

Social-Democrats know that if Von Plehve or Sergius would possess each of them thousands of lives, their execution would not expiate even a particle of their crimes.

At the same time Social-Democrats *do not believe* that the *execution of single members of the Russian Government by single intellectuals* ought to be raised to the dignity of a system adopted by a political party as such. Such terroristic acts are probably unavoidable but entail a deplorable waste of energy.

Young as the Russian Social-Democratic party is, (it started about 1896) it attained marvelous success.

The propaganda among the working class worked like magic.

There are two other parties to be considered as opposition forces.

One of them is the so-called Socialist-Revolutionist party. That party claims to represent the interests of all the toiling masses of the Russian people. But actually they ignore the working class and concentrate their attention upon the peasants.

The Revolutionists believe that the archaic village commune, the "mir," can and has to be preserved in order to allow Russia to avoid the evils of Capitalism and proletarianisation of the masses.

The Revolutionists do not believe in the most essential part of economic determinism—in the law of development of social economic institutions.

The "Revolutionists" want to stop the evolutionary march of the sun of the proletariat at the Gibeon of common tenure of land, to arrest the movement of the moon of capitalism in the Avalon valley of dwarfed manufacture.

The "Revolutionists" are nationalists and utopians in their theories and Jacobins in their tactics.

The interests of the Russian proletariat in general and of its liberation demand its organization into an independent political force.

However, the "Socialist Revolutionists" are—theoretically and by their tactics—opposing the endeavors of the Social Democrats to cement the working class into one political party.

The "Revolutionists" bend all their energies toward keeping the workingmen in an amorphous mass, that may be used as a tool only by the liberal middle class.

The "Revolutionists" represent therefore but a branch of the middle-class-democratic faction in Russia.

The middle-class tendencies of the "Revolutionists" are the more pernicious, because they are masked by the banner of Socialism.

The "Revolutionists" believe in manufacturing history by assassinations.

The third party is the party of the liberals.

This outspokenly middle-class party is composed of professionalists of all kinds, manufacturers, merchants and a motley crowd of intellectuals of rather indefinite occupation.

The liberals, too, would like to enjoy political freedom.

They would certainly condescend to graciously accept a liberal constitution presented to them on a silver tray.

But they want the "common people" (the "dear" common people) to win it for them by the sacrifice of life and limb.

The liberals represent an opposition party, but by no means a revolutionary force.

It is rather an anti-revolutionist and anti-proletarian movement.

The Social-Democrats are supported by the working class.

The "Revolutionists" back up their demands from the autocracy by terroristic acts.

The liberals talk and fill the waste-basket of the government with humble petitions.

Divergent as these three parties may be in their theoretical conceptions and tactics they are united on one vital point, namely, in their negative attitude toward the autocracy of the Czar.

The struggle against the autocracy of the Czar is a struggle against wild barbarity and eternal strife, it is a struggle for civilization and peace.

A wave of reaction would encircle the globe in case the Russian government would succeed in drowning the revolutionary movement in the blood of the people.

The victory of the revolutionary elements in Russia will be the victory of all liberty-loving men and women of the world.

The Russian people are now struggling for the liberties we enjoy here in the United States, the liberties the fathers of the Republic conquered a hundred years ago.

The Russian revolution has probably passed its most dramatic, spectacular stage.

Russia now entered into an era of chronic revolution.

The revolutionization of all the classes and masses of Russia is spreading and deepening, the revolutionary flames are working their way toward the shaky throne of the Czar and worm eaten altar of the State Church and cannot be extinguished till Absolutism and Parasitism will be no more.

The time has passed when the people of Russia could be pacified by political charity in the shape of an advisory board composed of representatives of various classes without power or authority to legislate or control the budget of the State, as proposed by the Czar under the stress of a disastrous war.

The Russian people is now determined to get rid of the double yoke of political and economic oppression.

The Russian struggle is the world's struggle.

The Chinese walls that used to divide countries and nations have crumbled into dust and ashes.

There is at present only one nation—the human race.

There is at present only one world-struggle, the struggle of the vast majority of the human race, of the toiling masses against a small minority of political and social-economic parasites.

Perish Russian autocracy! Long live the Russian Revolution!

Perish Parasitism! Long live the proletariat of all nations!

I. LADOFF.

New York. March, 1905.

The Truth About the War.*

Soldiers! You are not led into a war, but to the slaughtering pen. Incapable generals and immature officers will lead you against the Japanese bullets that will kill you. The imperial government founds its hopes on the fact that Russia is rich in human beings, that it has an immense supply of men whom it can feed into the mouths of the cannons. They say, "If the Japanese will have killed one hundred thousand of our suffering men, their strength will also be exhausted." But this calculation is wrong. The Japanese have an army of a million men; they get money from the English and the Americans. Furthermore they instruct the Chinese in the use of arms and have already collected a strong army in China. This is the truth about the war. The government is afraid of the truth. We distribute this leaflet among you; we are threatened by imprisonment and forced labor in so doing. Why? Because we speak the truth. Your superiors command you to deliver to them every piece of literature without reading it. Why should you not read it? Simply because you have been forbidden to read it. You see, then, they are afraid of our words. For these words carry within them the power of truth.

LISTEN TO THE TRUTH!

Many tens of thousands have already been killed in this war, many tens of thousands wounded, but still many more lie sick in the hospitals. These sick men are many weeks under way, and they arrive at the hospitals half dead. They never get a chance to change clothes. They have to march in the weltering heat of the sun, in endless rains, or in snow storms and cold. The rulers place upon your shoulders a kit weighing one pood and a half, regardless of the fact that you can hardly drag your legs along without it. You must climb over mountains, or narrow paths and on the verge of precipices. Many have lost their reason from heat and exhaustion. Whole wagon-loads of insane have been carried away from the battle field. Confusion reigns in the army. Provisions are not distributed. The soldiers are glad to get hard-tack and rotten canned goods. No information is secured about the enemy. Now he is said to be here, then there. Nobody knows how strong the enemy is, or where his main forces are. Suddenly the Japanese surprise you unprepared with the full power of their concentrated troops. Our batteries fire at random because they are unable to determine where the enemy is; but the Japanese artillery sweeps our soldiers into their graves by the thousand.

* Manifesto of Russian Democracy.

They told you that the Russian army retreated in full order and according to a preconceived plan. They have lied to you. It was a panic-stricken flight. The soldiers lost their arms and carried neither wounded nor dead with them. Thousands of Russians are in captivity. Dead men and horses have accumulated among Russians and Japanese to such an extent that it is impossible to bury them all. The Japanese tried to burn the corpses, but even so they did not manage to dispose of them all. The festering corpses have poisoned the rivers, the springs and the wells. For this reason, and on account of the bad food, such diseases as cholera, pest, and typhoid fever are ravaging the ranks of the soldiers. Myriads of flies are gathering poison from the dead bodies and transferring it to the living. Those who are stung by these flies swell up and die amid horrible tortures. The number of physicians is inadequate, the supply of drugs is scant, and there are not enough beds to accommodate the sick. The diseased and wounded are rolling about in their pains on the wet soil, among men infested with infectuous diseases, and among men whose minds are wandering in fever paroxysms. Under these conditions it is better to be killed by the bullets of the enemy than to go to the hospital. You are doomed to die any way, only your sufferings are greater in the hospital. If they discharge you from the hospital under the pretense that you have been cured, you are either a cripple or an invalid for life. A campaign in the winter is still worse than in the summer. Even those who are condemned to forced labor in Siberia are transported only in the summer or spring. But you are supposed to fight in the Siberian cold. Before you meet the enemy, you must frequently march hundreds of versts. Those who have been sentenced can at least march on the mail-roads, at night they find shelter in the barracks, and they have supplies on which they may feed. But the soldier cannot choose his road. He must march cross country, and over mountains, where there is no path, nothing but mountains of snow, and below them precipices and abysses. There are no barracks in the Manchurian Mountains. How would it have been possible to build barracks for hundreds of thousands? In summer time, tents give shelter for the night. But what good are they in winter in Siberian colds? Rivers and wells are frozen hard, and water cannot be obtained anywhere. Blizzards chill you to the bone. And whence will you obtain food for many hundreds of thousands of soldiers? So long as it was possible to do so, the soldiers bought or robbed from the Chinese in Manchuria that which they could not obtain from Russia. But now Manchuria has been devastated and its best regions are in the hands of the enemy. All the bread has been consumed, the domestic animals extinguished, the fields trampled. No harvest was possible and hundreds of villages were burned. No bread, no meat, no vegetables—every-

thing must be transported across thousands of versts from Russia, through pathless and snow-covered territories. Icy mountains and snow-filled valleys, terrible blizzards and cruel frosts; no shelter, no food, nothing to drink; cold, hunger and disease; finally the bullets of the enemy to save you from your suffering,—these are the things that wait for you in war!

You are led into hell. And who leads you? The experienced officers have all been killed. In order to fill their places, the emperor advanced by one stroke of his pen two thousand three hundred ensigns, who had not yet completed their education, to officers. These young men without knowledge, without experience, with immature boyish brains, are to be your commanders. The fate of an army of half a million men, your lives and the future of your families, depend on the arbitrary will of these green youngsters. Is not this insanity? An army of whiskered men leave home, wives and children, and march ten thousand verst under the leadership of green boys in order to die in a desert of snow! And what is their purpose? Is it to defend the throne and the fatherland? Our fatherland is not Manchuria, but Russia, a Russian people on Russian soil. Manchuria belongs neither to the Russians nor to the Japanese, but to those who live there, who till the Manchurian soil, who have built the Manchurian cities and villages,—the Manchurian people. Foreign invaders are simply taking possession of Manchuria and killing its lawful owners,—the Manchurian farmers. Two robbers have entered a stranger's yard, and each one of them cries, "This is mine." This is the cause of the war. And what is the result? The Manchurian nation has been extinguished, and now the Russian and Japanese nations are decimated. The Japanese working class suffer from this war just as much as the Russian laborer and farmer. For them, the war has only death and ruin in store.

There is no enmity between the nations. The Japanese Socialist declared in the name of the Japanese working class that they were opposed to the war and demanded its termination. We Russian Socialists demand the same. The Russian nation has no interest in fertilizing Manchurian soil with Russian corpses, no matter how many Japanese bodies may do the same thing. The welfare of the fatherland is the welfare of the working class. It is to this end that we must labor and struggle.

The imperial government is to blame for this war. We are called upon to defend the throne of the emperor. But our whole misfortune is precisely due to the fact that the emperor and his bureaucracy are the rulers of Russia. The Czar has far too much power. He alone is master of all Russia. The other hundred and forty millions are slaves. The Czar commands, and one hundred thousand soldiers march into the teeth of death without resistance. So long as this sort of thing continues, so long as the Czar can put

a fresh army into the place of a defeated one, just so long will he not yield. The Czar has no sympathy for the people, he does not care how many of them die so long as he wins. But there is no victory, nor is victory in store, and if it were, it would not help the people any.—it simply means that more and more people are going to be killed.

The war will never end until the people refuse to fight for the rulers. And it will come to that. Enough people have been killed. Shall all of them die? Do not go to war! Demand peace! Soldiers, you are committing suicide! Why do you submit to everything like stupid animals? You have the power. If you refuse you can have anything you want. Refuse to go to war!

REFUSE TO GO TO WAR!

Of course, you will be threatened with punishment, if you do so. But can your punishment be any worse than that which is in store for you in war? The penitentiary, the jail, are not half as bad as the Siberian barracks and the camps in the open, in the wintry cold. The prison companies and forced labor are less terrible than a winter campaign across the icy mountains of Manchuria and Korea, than the endless marches through bleak snow-fields, without roads, without shelter, and with hunger, rags, numerous diseases, and the murderous fire of the enemy staring into your faces. The worst that can befall you here is to be shot to death. But since death is your almost certain fate, does it matter to you where you die? Here or in Manchuria, the end is sure to come. But here this end threatens only a few of you, perhaps every tenth man. For if whole regiments revolt and refuse to go to war, the government will not think of punishing them, but will submit to the will of the people.

SOLDIERS, YOU HAVE THE POWER!

You have but to will it, and everything will go as you want it. Refuse to obey, rise in great numbers, and there is no power that will oppose you. The officers and nobles will crawl tremblingly into their corners. Many of you know this, many of you think so, but many of you think: Let others make a beginning, and then I'll join them. Talk it over among yourselves! For this reason we give you this leaflet. All for one and one for all! Volunteers, advance! Do here what you would do in war! If thousands of volunteers are willing to run into the mouths of the Japanese guns and grenades, there will surely be a few volunteers ready in each company to cry out: "Stop this murder of the people! We do not want any war! Down with autocracy!"

Reservists! If you have no compassion for yourselves, think of your wives and children. In what condition do you leave them? Your home is ruined, your relatives are turned into paupers by the

war. Why do you permit that? Come to your senses! Revolt! Do not go to war! Refuse to serve in the army! Sacrifices must be made, nothing can be accomplished without sacrifices. But consider how many victims the Japanese war has already swallowed and how many it will swallow in the future. Compared to these tens of thousands of victims, the number of those daring men who will now suffer will be small, even if they pay with their lives for their success in arousing the mass of the soldiers. But they will save thousands of lives by their heroism, they will preserve thousands of families from ruin, and they will bring peace to our country. You have the choice between a war in which you are finally killed by Japanese bullets, or a revolution and peace bought with only a few victims. Choose between war and slavery, or peace and liberty. Soldiers, revolt! Demand peace, demand the abolition of the imperial government and the election of a people's parliament and government, if they order you to fall in line, so they may take you to the railway station and transport you to the scene of war, do not move a limb, disregard the order, and cry out "Enough of this robbery! Down with autocracy! Hurrah for the people!" Refuse to step into the railway cars! You can make up your mind at any station to leave the train and interrupt your journey.

Soldiers you are not alone!

The entire Russian working class stands by you in the fight for peace and against autocracy. Revolt! Millions of laborers and farmers will revolt with you. You know that your brothers, the laborers, fight for political freedom without any regard for their safety. Nothing stands in their way but the barrels of your rifles. If the army unites with the working class the people can have anything they want. Go to the laborers, unite with them! Soldiers you have nothing to lose. The imperial government is playing with your lives. But this government is lost. If you revolt you will secure liberty. Revolt! Down with autocracy! Hurrah for peace and liberty! Hurrah for the working class!

Translated by Ernest Untermann.

EDITORIAL

Some Matters of Tactics.

Unless all signs fail we are in a critical position in the internal organization of the Socialist Movement. Numerous apparently isolated facts when brought together show a connection, inter-relation and tendency that deserve consideration.

For some time there have been two extreme camps within the Socialist party, both combined, insignificant in numbers, intelligence or activity—the so-called Opportunists and Impossibleists. Each lives largely by using the other as a bogey-man and both are a general nuisance from the point of view of Socialist activity. Just now, however, owing to some other facts, their presence renders them capable of creating trouble wholly disproportionate to their actual importance. These other facts are certain tendencies within the moribund Socialist Labor Party, and the trade union movement.

The S. L. P. ceased to be a political party about two years ago. It had gradually lost all possibility of, or desire for general Socialist propaganda or political activity. The election last fall showed these facts so plainly that even its own membership could no longer deny them. It had become little more than an intriguing personal clique. In its central figure, Daniel DeLeon, it possesses a man who, within just such little circles, is a master of petty intrigue. His situation is desperate. This is not because the S. L. P. is no longer capable of effective Socialist propaganda or even that its vote grows steadily less. All of these things could have been borne in patience by the gang of little business men who compose the inner circle. But the dues-paying membership is disappearing. Something must be done, and DeLeon set about doing it in his characteristic manner.

He cast his eyes towards the Socialist Party for which he had hitherto had nothing but foul abuse and falsification. Now, however, he thought he saw the possibility of fomenting discord until he should create sufficient troubled waters to make his fishing productive of results. Immediately after election he sent out a feeler in the shape of an editorial suggesting that there might possibly be a few voters in

the Socialist Party who were not wholly fools and scoundrels, a concession he had never previously made. For those who have watched DeLeon for years the succeeding steps could have been foretold from the beginning. Soon there appeared some inspired letters suggesting that even a Unity Conference might be possible.

Then came his "Are we at Bulgaria" department, something which those who have read his "Pages of Roman History" and similar round-about methods of testing his membership before cracking the whip, at once recognized as familiar. This discussion was supposed to raise the question as to whether conditions here were similar to those in Bulgaria, where a unity of Socialist forces was being discussed. Bulgaria being an absolutely unknown ground to the S. L. P. membership could safely be used to point out any sort of an illustration or draw any conclusion. Hence his selection of this country rather than Italy or France where a similar unification was going on, but where the facts were more easily obtainable. Then came rumors from all over the country that certain groups of "impossibilists" within the Socialist Party were considering affiliation with the S. L. P.

The next step in the story was the appearance of the Manifesto of the Industrial Unionists.

The importance of this phase of events in the general scheme whose outlines we are tracing is such as to justify a somewhat fuller discussion than of some of the other points. Here is a movement arising directly from the conditions of industrial development. Many men within and without unions now federated with the A. F. of L. have become so disgusted with the actions of the central organization and their dickering with capitalist politicians and Civic Federation tricksters that they can no longer endure it. These men have called for a conference of their fellow workers to discuss this situation. Believing this to be a movement in advance two or three Socialists have taken part in this consultation.

There is nothing whatever about this to give encouragement to the advocates of the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance. The new movement is in every essential way differentiated from that moribund organization. The S. T. and L. A. originated at an S. L. P. convention as a scheme of DeLeon to secure revenge on the Knights of Labor, where his attempted "deal" with Sovereign for the editorship of the Knights of Labor Journal had fallen through. The Manifesto of the Industrial Unionists was a call for consultation and organization, sent out to the working class of America. If there are any concerned in that call who are ambitious to play DeLeon to a new S. T. and L. A. then the sooner their presence is known the better, that the fight may be made on clear cut lines. The S. T. and L. A. has two kinds of members,—one to pay dues, the other to hold offices,—a plan especially designed to create an inner circle subject to the domination of the S. L. P. bosses. The proposed new organization calls for complete separation between the unions and all political parties,—a position identical with that of the European Socialists and Trade Unionists of today.

Right here let us puncture a falsehood started by DeLeon and Sanial, and carefully kept alive by them and their followers and repeated by Comrade Bohn elsewhere in this issue. This is the statement that the German Social Democratic Unions have continuously fought the Hirsch-Dunker unions in the same manner as the S. T. and L. A. has fought the American pure and simple organization. Nothing could be further from the truth. For nearly ten years we have been fairly close readers of *Vorwaerts* and the *Neue Zeit*. In none of these do we find anything comparable to the weekly screeds appearing in the organ of the S. L. P. On the contrary the two unions have worked in close co-operation from the very beginning and today it is the boast of the Socialists that the Christian and Hirsch-Dunker unions look to the Social Democratic members in the Reichstag to advance their measures. Furthermore, it is now being generally recognized by the German Social Democracy that direct affiliation between a political party and the unions is a mistake.

It will be noted that this illustration cuts both ways. Some Socialist Party members would have that organization act as a sort of shepherd dog for the A. F. of L. leaders, driving the rebellious members back into the fold of the fakirs. The S. L. P. and Impossibilists, on the other hand, would waste all energy in fierce attack on members, organization and fakirs alike. The new movement for Industrial Unionism follows the plan agreeing with the ripest experience of Germany, and while offering every encouragement to those who have reached a sufficient degree of intelligent class-consciousness to desire an organization in accord with modern industrial development, it also is willing to extend aid and sympathy to those who, with a less perfect form of organization and more indistinct recognition of class interests, and who even though they may still have false leaders, are at least engaged in conflict with the master class. We must guide against any such marriage to pure and simpledom as will lead us to confuse indistinct and ignorant class revolt with Socialism. Otherwise we shall find our Socialist Party simply a "labor" party ready to follow whoever may use the shibboleths of labor. A striking instance of this has been furnished by the recent experience in Massachusetts. It is significant that Boston, where, if anywhere in the United States, there is need of education along these lines, is the one city that has found it necessary to set itself up as a mentor of those who happen to know enough of Socialist philosophy and the Class Struggle to put it in practice. It is quite generally noticeable in this connection that those who have been most free in their attacks on the two or three individuals who took part in this conference without being manual wage-workers have not themselves published any *fac simile* of their trade union cards. The Socialists who took part in that conference did not claim to take the Socialist Party with them or to speak for it, and its endorsement is neither asked nor desired. While criticism of the proposed organization is perfectly proper and desirable, the sort of personal insinuations that have been hitherto mixed with that criticism savors strongly of arrogant impertinence, to use no stronger phrase.

This whole matter, however, derives its principal importance from its relation to the general tendencies we have been discussing. DeLeon thought he saw an opportunity and began to set the wheels of his machine in motion. If he could in some way hitch himself on to this new organization he would be able, to infuse the semblance of life into the political and economic corpses of the S. L. P. and the S. T. and L. A. Unfortunately he received assistance in this from the attitude of some of those prominent previously in the A. L. U. who did not know the inside history of the DeLeonistic organization.

A "discussion" was started in the columns of the *Weekly People* as to the advisability of attending the proposed conference. Throughout this entire discussion the dominating note is the hope of capturing the new organization or at least of reviving the corpses referred to above. In this effort they have been very ably aided by Gompers and the whole Civic Federation bunch of labor unions and also by those Socialists to whom the A. F. of L. is a sacred idol. Both of these factors unite with DeLeon in declaring the new movement to be an attempt to re-establish the S. T. and L. A. Certainly those Socialists ought to be proud of the company they are in.

Next came DeLeon's "volcanic rumblings," consisting of a series of articles designed to show the existence of inharmonious elements in the Socialist Party. Here again there was a strange combination working for the same end. We have Comrade Will attempting to read everybody out of the party who is not willing to accept the unsavory mixture of populism, mysticism and capitalist economics published by him in *Social Ethics*. In this notable effort he is backed up,—if we are to believe that what we see in some of the Socialist papers represents the real opinions of their writers—by some who are supposed to know international socialism. Such a condition as this affords a fertile field for men of the character of J. Wilson, (*alias* Carlos) Becker whose slippery record is known to every one familiar with Socialist Labor Party history. Comrade Will may well be thankful for the sort of enemies he has been able to make, if Becker is a sample, for he is certainly worth much more as an enemy than as a friend.

Taking all these things together the scheme becomes plain. A bunch of Impossibilists in the Socialist Party with enough muddle-headed Opportunists to use as bogey-men to scare those who are really revolutionary: a small, compact body of S. L. P. intriguers industriously at work throughout the country, and some trade unionist socialists attempting to bulldoze all those who dare to attempt to further the cause of Socialism and unionism and unions even at the expense of a few fakirs or even (most horrible of all) a few Socialist votes, and you have a field capable of producing some very fruitful, if unsavory results.

There is not a shadow of doubt in our mind that DeLeon is now scheming to bring about a proposal for a sham unity gathering, at which, by making a plausible appeal on the ground of revolutionary tactics, coupled with abuse of all who do not agree with him, and arousing prei-

udice against the bogey-men of the *Social Ethics* type, all of which he knows so well how to do, would give him a considerable accession of new dupes and dues-payers such as he is now sorely in need of.

We regret very much having to stir up this ill-smelling mess and place it before our readers, but we believe that the occasion warrants it. The whole situation can be easily met if met frankly, openly by Socialists. Let us not be afraid to tell the truth when we see that Socialism is being diluted with capitalism to make it more pleasant to the taste. Let us not permit our friendship for the unions to lead us into any over-looking of the very things that are wrecking those unions. Let us not for a moment relax our efforts at "boring from within." Let those Socialists who believe that they can do the best work while retaining membership within the unions now affiliated with the A. F. of L. continue in their efforts to make those organizations effective fighters for working-class interests. Let us lend every aid in our power to workmen and women wherever they are battling against their masters. But let us also recognize that because some men choose to organize along the lines of the class struggle and in accord with economic evolution, it is no reason that they should be refused all sympathy and assistance by socialists.

Furthermore, so far as DeLeon's little scheme is concerned, there is no danger unless he receives assistance from within the Socialist Party. If there are any members of the Socialist Party who believe that there is still life and capacity for good in the S. L. P., and who wish to attempt the task of galvanizing it into life and then worshipping at the feet of its boss, then they should get into the S. L. P. as quick as they can. Any speakers whose actions show them to be emissaries of DeLeon within the Socialist Party should be quickly, quietly and certainly assisted to get out of that organization. We have but to uncover the present *opera bouffe* conspiracy to crush it.

So far as the convention of Industrial Unionists for next June is concerned,—the S. L. P. men have exactly as many rights there as any other persons. What takes place there is something that can affect only indirectly either the S. P. or the S. L. P. We believe that gathering will be one of the most momentous for the working-class movement ever held in this country. We hope that its membership may be as large as possible. We urge that its plans be made the subject of the most searching criticism. Only in this way will such defects as they include be discovered in time to remedy them. But we do ask that in making such criticism, the merits of the plan be considered and not the personalities of a few of the individuals whose names happen to be signed to the original call. It might also be well for critics not to assume that they speak in the name of the Socialist Party or that they possess all the knowledge in existence on the trade-union question. Sometimes this makes the critics somewhat ridiculous, as for example where one comrade gravely informed his readers that "Comrade Debs and Mother Jones are good agitators, and they ought to confine themselves to that work,"—while the very wise critic does the thinking for them we suppose.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

Since the last issue of the REVIEW two important events have interested the labor world. The first was the threatened test of strength between the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen on the New York, New Haven & Hartford railway. For a number of years there has been considerable ill feeling manifested toward the engineers by railway employes in other branches owing to the policy of exclusiveness that has been followed by the former. Their motto has been: "No entangling alliances," that is, no sympathy strikes or practical aid to be extended to other railway men, and on more than one occasion the engineers stood idly by while some corporation beat the organized employes of some other branch of railroad-ing into a pulp, and even assisted the masters by hauling trains carrying scab crews. For these and other reasons the great bulk of trade union-ists of the country have had little respect for the B. of L. E. and its snobbish (often mis-called "aristocratic") tactics, and their sympathies were all on the side of the firemen in the controversy on the N. Y., N. H. & H. road. The principal grievance of the firemen was that they desired recognition for the engineers who are in their union—who were promoted as firemen from time to time, but did not withdraw from the B. of L. F. because of the insurance and other beneficial features in which they were interested—and they claim their men had been discriminated against by both the B. of L. E. and the railway magnates. Throughout the controversy the railway officials took the side of the engineers, although pretending to be neutral, and when it became manifest that a strike would be ordered hundreds of engineers and firemen were stationed all along the line, many of whom were said to carry union cards, ready to take the places of the B. of L. F. men. The result was that the latter concluded that discretion is the better part of valor and remained at work. This incident, however, served to destroy another idol. President Mellen, of the above-named railway, has for several years been heralded near and far as a great "workingman's friend," but the fact that his corporation, according to Boston papers, spent \$250,000 in organizing an army of scabs merely to destroy the firemen has exposed the true character of that gentleman and fits him for a position of honor in the Civic Federation. Furthermore the hostility that existed between the firemen and engineers has been greatly intensified, and the rank and file of the B. of L. F. not only denounce Mellen for refusing recognition to their members, but they threaten to revenge themselves upon the engineers. The firemen claim that if the policy inaugurated on the Eastern road is generally enforced they will lose their autonomy as an organization and be compelled to play second fiddle to the engineers all over the country. While the engineers seem to have won an advantage in this jurisdiction problem and have the support of the railway

magnates, the sympathy of the other railway organizations is largely on the side of the firemen, and if an open rupture does come, as some of the men insist will be the case sooner or later, it will be difficult to predict the outcome.

Another event that caused no end of discussion in labor circles was the brief strike on the elevated and subway roads in New York. Here, too, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers played a part. It is the first time in some years that the B. of L. E. was mixed up in a walkout, and the novelty of the situation was so extraordinary that Chief Stone became dizzy from the effects and abandoned the motormen by ordering them back to work and withdrawing their charter, which action was endorsed by all the capitalists in the country and destroyed the movement. Stone and other labor and corporation officials claimed that the men violated agreements, and it was even charged that the strike leaders were hired to cause trouble. On the other hand the New York unionists assert with strong emphasis that the corporation constantly ignored its contracts with the employes and victimized many of the men, especially those active in union affairs, upon the slightest pretext, and that the workers were deliberately betrayed by their national officers. No matter which of the contending parties is right—whether the New York corporation bribed local union officials to precipitate the trouble in order that the organizations might be crushed, or seduced the national officers into throwing a wet blanket over the movement—the net result is that another little tin god has fallen from his pedestal, and he is none other than Mr. August Belmont, president of the National Civic Federation and grand high chief of all “workingmen’s friends.” Belmont is generally known as the American agent of the Rothschilds and an important cog in the Standard Oil “system.” He gained considerable notoriety last year in purchasing the Democratic Presidential nomination for Judge Parker, which wonderful exploit, it seems, peculiarly fitted him to step into the late Senator Hanna’s shoes. While it is true that the immaculate Carnegie was the first choice of the beloved brethren for president of the N. C. F., when the hero of Homestead waved aside the proffered crown it logically went to the next best saint. It will be remembered that when the battle at Homestead occurred Carnegie had just gone to Scotland, and he was speechless with surprise when he learned that his loyal subjects had rebelled and Pinkertons had nobly gone to his rescue. And so Belmont was also unexpectedly absent in Florida when his prosperous workingmen, to the number of over 5,000, broke a “sacred agreement” and rushed out on strike, probably because conditions had become too unbearable. Judge of his surprise, too, when he learned that Strike-breaker Farley had an army of scabs and thugs stationed in and about New York to jump in and take jobs the moment they were vacated by the unionists. Whereupon Mr. Belmont was so pleased that everything moved so smoothly that he telegraphed four weeks’ extra pay to his loyal subjects who played the traitor to their class and remained at work, and made a personal present of \$25,000 to his man Farley as a reward for his timely assistance. The New York papers declare that Farley has become a millionaire because of his thrift and enterprise as a professional scab-leader and strike-breaker. Having achieved such wonderful success, this great patriot is also entitled to a seat in the Civic Federation, where he may crack jokes with labor leaders, bask in the sunshine of the millionaires and receive the blessings of the saintly old sky-pilots. Of course, Farley’s master, Belmont, declared that the union agitators are a bad lot, who, to gain a point, would not only injure the corporation, but inconvenience the dear public and paralyze business. A man who was sleek enough to manipulate that subway scheme, wherein the munic-

ipality bonds itself to his gang, builds a tunnel and turns it over to him, paying him interest and profits and only owns the name, is surely entitled to lecture the laborers who do his work for a miserable pittance and who ought to be mighty glad that they are alive. Just as it was almost sacreligious to question any of the acts of Hanna in the past few years, I suppose it will be regarded as high treason to object to anything that Belmont may say or do.

The contingent of "workingmen's friends" in the political world are no less active than their class in industrial affairs. It has already been pointed out in this column that for the forty-leventh time the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills in Congress have been put to sleep—even the abortion known as the Jenkins-Garfield injunction regular went into a pigeon-hole. To show that he meant no harm in endorsing the latter makeshift, President Roosevelt demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Parry people, who fought those bills in Congress, that he can be depended upon to do the right thing at the right time. In the little factional struggles that the capitalistic politicians have among themselves it happens occasionally that some of them fare badly for the time being. Thus in the election last fall the row in the Republican family of Wisconsin resulted in the signal triumph of Gov. LaFollette, who was not only re-elected to succeed himself, but landed sufficient of his friends in the Legislature to ensure his promotion to the United States Senate. In due time Senator Quarles was compelled to walk the plank, whereupon Republican trade unionists in that state prepared to swing their hats and cheer while the Parry fat man looked sad. The laborites were pardonably pleased because Mr. Quarles' law firm is regarded as the semi-official head of the open shop movement in Wisconsin. But just as LaFollette stepped into Quarles' shoes who should rush to the center of the stage brandishing a state paper but "Terrible Teddy!" Throwing his arms about Quarles and glaring at the labor mob he announced in tones of thunder that the repudiated Wisconsin statesman had been appointed to a life position as a United States judge. Thereupon the fat men fell upon each others' necks and wept tears of joy down each others' backbones and the laborites in turn became a sad lot of foiled villains. It is now announced that Judge Quarles will take a trip to Europe to enjoy a much-needed rest after his valiant service in safeguarding labor's interests in Congress and before taking his place upon the bench to pass upon such labor laws as are brought before him. Meanwhile President Roosevelt, "the father of the open shop," as the Parryites fondly refer to him, is being deluged with congratulatory epistles upon the wisdom of his appointment. Now if Roosevelt would only appoint Parry as Secretary of State we would all be happy.

It will be a spectacle for the gods when John B. Lennon, treasurer of the A. F. of L., comes into the Pittsburg convention this year accompanied by two "red button" colleagues, and possibly a third one. John B. is one of Gompers' most astute floor leaders, and is looked up to with awe and admiration by many of the conservative element because he is ultra in that respect. How Lennon has sawed the air in past gatherings and demolished the arguments of the advocates of class-conscious political action! At the same time he wanted it understood that he is something of a socialist, too, but he doesn't want to jar the trade union movement by playing with this political dynamite in labor conventions. Sure! If it should explode and awaken everybody the pure and simple life would become too strenuous. Why charge the quiet and sleepy atmosphere of old Bloomington, Illinois, with an electric shock that might knock the pleasant little tailor off his bench? But the irreverent knights of the goose recently gathered in that very place and started to paint

the town red, and they got in a few daubs as a starter. In fact, Bro. Lennon was not quite sure of his own scalp. I am informed that he declared in a speech before the tailors' convention that he did not support resolutions declaring for socialism in A. F. of L. conventions because they were not radical enough! While Socialists are not made by the passage of high-sounding resolutions, still it is necessary to present resolutions in order to secure a discussion, and sometimes they also serve to measure the growth of socialistic sentiment. In the last year or two the growth of the principles of socialism made marked progress in the trade union movement despite the efforts of some of the officials to discourage and ridicule the "red button" propaganda, and there is seldom a convention held in which there is not a good sprinkling of Socialists. In the natural order of things, and without any great necessity to force the issue, other officials will undoubtedly be made aware of the fact that a revolution of thought is taking place among the rank and file of American workingmen, and if the former persist in sitting upon the safety valve and are blown up in the air by their own members they have nobody to blame but themselves. If I am not mistaken the example set by the tailors will be followed by the machinists and several other unions in their next conventions, when demands will be made by the radical political element for something like proportional representation, which many of the organizations preach but don't practice. To see "Jim" O'Connell and his delegation in an A. F. of L. convention one would never suspect that there is a Socialist in the international association, and yet they are the most active workers in scores of cities and towns for which they receive no more credit or consideration than a rabbit. The same is true in the Carpenters' Brotherhood, among the miners and many other organizations. Whether the officers know it or not, it is nevertheless a fact that the great bulk of the 400,000 votes counted for the Socialist Party last fall came from trade union ranks, especially in industrial centres, and that number is going to increase steadily and surely, no matter what the wishes of the capitalistic opposition or our conservative friends in labor's ranks may be in the premises. As a rule, workingmen who become Socialists remain Socialists—they cannot well forget what they have learned. There are exceptions, of course, and those who have recanted are now living to see that the world is regarding the Socialist philosophy as the most virile and far-reaching of our time, and daily growing in popularity and influence. And the rapid transformation that is taking place in industry, the concentration of capital, and the many new issues that are being forced to the front by encroaching employers will stimulate thought and action in the laboring mass, and as intelligence increases among the workers they will not be satisfied to depend upon the old methods of pitting their powers of endurance against the enemy that possesses the economic and political powers. Not that the strike and boycott will be discarded: those weapons will be augmented and strengthened by the scientific machinery of the law in labor's control, and thus the workers will dominate, as they have the right, or should have.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

RUSSIA.

There seems to be a momentary lull in the Russian storm, if we are to believe the reports appearing in the capitalist press. But whenever the veil is lifted enough for us to see anything of the actual conditions, a scene of conflict is revealed extending over almost all Russia. Strikes are breaking out everywhere. Poland and Finland are in almost open revolt. Disaffection is reported in the army at numerous points. The red terror carries on its deadly work of execution upon the tyrants and murderers who compose the autocracy. Rumors come of revolutionists being found within the Czar's household, and the St. Petersburg police have become so affected with revolutionary sympathies that it has been found necessary to accompany each policeman with a Cossack. Such a condition cannot long be maintained.

The socialists of the world are offering an excellent example of international solidarity. From every corner of the world funds are pouring in to assist the Russian comrades. One single collecting agency in the United States, has already sent over two thousand dollars and is sending more weekly. Many more sums are doubtless sent directly by those who have left friends behind in Russia. European countries are responding much more liberally, because of their greater realization of the need. Indeed the sums that have been sent by American Socialists are still so small as to be disgraceful.

In January, 1905, representatives of the following organizations met in joint conference: The Russian Social-Democratic Labor-Party; The General Jewish Labor Federation of Lithuania, Poland, and Russia; the Lettish Social-Democratic Labor-Party; and the Revolutionary Party of the Ukraine. Invitations had also been extended to the Social Democracy of Poland and Lithuania, the Polish Socialist Party (Proletariat), and the Armenian Social-Democratic Labor-Organization. These organizations did not send any representatives, although the two last-named had declared their intention to take part in the conference.

The conference lasted two days. A number of tactical and organization questions was discussed, and a manifesto (published in the January INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW) drawn up enumerating the immediate political demands. Furthermore it was resolved to issue a manifesto to the proletariat of entire Russia which will be published later on.

The following resolution relative to compromise action with liberal and democratic parties was adopted: "Whereas, The widespread revolutionary movement of the middle class will produce various organizations with more or less definite Democratic programs or aims, which will give rise in these tendencies and organizations to the desire of uniting all forces opposed to autocracy—without regard to their special programs, so long as they are united on the main proposition of abolishing absolut-

ism, and for the purpose of accomplishing this aim as rapidly as possible;

"And whereas, This desire for united action of all forces induces some middle-class organizations to request the co-operation of proletarian organizations;

"And whereas, The Social Democracy, having for its principal aim the abolition of the class-character of present society by means of the conquest of the political power on the part of the working class, regards it as its main duty to promote the development of class-consciousness among the working people and their unification in a separate Social-Democratic Party;

"And whereas, This duty can be fulfilled only when the Social-Democracy takes part in the entire political activity of the country as an independent party, opposed to all capitalist parties and standing in each individual case on its own program and revolutionary tactics;

"Resolved, That we consider it impracticable to enter into any alliance with capitalist parties aiming to exploit the forces of the proletariat in the interest of the transformation of Russia in the direction of capitalism, because such an exploitation would signify the dissolution of the Socialist Movement, its side-tracking into a Democratic Movement, and the transformation of the proletariat from an independent political power into a tool of the Democratic bourgeoisie in its class struggle against autocracy.

"However, the Social-Democracy does not decline, in the interest of the proletarian struggle for emancipation, to co-operate with bourgeois parties at certain moments of this struggle, but at the same time we shall never cease to point out the class-character of the bourgeois parties, we shall never sacrifice our program, or revolutionary tactics, and our independent organization. And we shall co-operate only on condition that the bourgeois parties will demand simultaneously with us the calling of a constitutional convention based on universal, equal, and direct suffrage with secret ballots."

Furthermore, the following resolution was adopted relative to the "Bloc" of the revolutionary and opposition parties and organization of Russia:

"Whereas, A really Democratic transformation of Russia is possible only by substituting a Democratic Republic in place of autocracy, this Republic to be based on universal, equal, and direct suffrage with secret ballots, and whereas such a transformation requires the calling of a constitutional convention based on this same suffrage;

"And whereas, The program of the Liberal-Democratic 'Bloc' demands an indefinite 'Democratic Regime' in place of a Democratic Republic, and has not yet definitely decided to favor the demand for a constitutional convention on the basis of universal, equal, and direct suffrage with secret ballots;

"Resolved, That the concentration of all revolutionary forces of Russia under the leadership of this 'Bloc' would seriously threaten the cause of those who demand a consistent Democratic transformation of Russia, and that therefore it would be irreconcilable with the Socialist program and tactics to have any Socialist organization join this 'Bloc.'"

There has been much discussion of the attitude of Father Gapone toward Socialism. The following statement sent by him to the International Socialist Bureau is self-explanatory:

"In order to clear up all misunderstanding in regard to the attempt on the part of the Russian workingmen to present a petition to the Czar at St. Petersburg, I will state, that a revolution alone will guarantee the defense of the interest of the masses of working people and will create a basis upon which sure triumph of International Socialism will be achieved. But I have the strong conviction, based upon my researches for liberty and truth, that unity of action alone can insure this.

"Please inform the Socialist Press and the Socialist delegates, who are advocating a union of the two socialist parties of Russia, in order to prepare a project of action for the organization of the Workingmen's Revolution in Russia, that I consider it premature to affiliate with either of the two parties until such common action is consummated.

"I send you my fraternal greeting and cry, 'Long live International Socialism.'"

GEORGE GAPONE.

MEXICO.

A letter received from a comrade formerly living in the United States, and for whose accuracy we can vouch, sends us an account of the following events. For obvious reasons the correspondent does not wish his name mentioned:

On February 19th of this year the first and last issue of a Socialist paper called "Aurora Social" was published in Guadalajara, Mexico. The editor was Rogue Estrada a student in the law school at that place. He was at once arrested and put into the states prison located in the city where the paper was published and which contains about 2,300 prisoners. Seventy-four fellow students issued a protest in leaflet form demanding his release, not because the signers were Socialists or necessarily favored Socialism, but because they wished to retain the right of free press which is guaranteed by the Mexican constitution. As a result he was finally released but was banished from the state of Jalisco, being allowed but one month in which to arrange his affairs. The paper was printed in Spanish and our correspondent assures us that its Socialism was the real thing. Comrade Estrada is a Mexican and doubtless will be heard from later. Meanwhile the government has demanded that the students publish a retraction of their protest. They have refused to do this and we shall wait further details of this struggle with interest.

JAPAN.

It is a long call from Mexico to Japan, but the following pathetic postal card which we have just received tells us how the same battle is going on, the same sufferings being endured, the same victory being kept in view by the Socialist workers in every corner of the world:

Dear Comrade: The final trial having decided, I am just going to the prison. Few days ago I have written an article concerning the details of the persecutions and sent it to Comrade T. Murai, whom you know. I hope you will hear from him. Now I must go. Au Revoir.

Fraternally yours,

D. KOTOKU.

GERMANY.

The capitalist press gave wide circulation to a report from Germany that the Socialists had been wholly discredited in the coal fields of Germany as a result of the Ruhr strike. It was reported that Socialist agitators had been driven from the mines and that the Socialist Party was practically disrupted in that locality. These are the facts, as reported by the papers on the spot. The German Miners' Union has grown with great rapidity during the last few months. Its membership has doubled in the Ruhr field and is increasing daily. The Miners' organ

which had 65,000 circulation on the first of January, 1905, now has 155,000 circulation and this paper supports the Social Democratic Party. The army of organized miners is today stronger and better equipped than ever before, and all this has been done in spite of the fact that the Anarchists and the capitalists combined to discredit in all possible ways the activity of the Socialists.

FRANCE.

A congress of the Jaures wing of the Socialist Party was held in Rouen the 26th and 28th of March. This congress will finally decide the question of the conflict between some of the parliamentary group and the party regarding the support of the Bourgeois government. Jaures is in favor of independent action, but the majority of the deputies oppose him. However, since the party has already decided upon the independent course it is probable that this policy will win out.

ITALY.

The workers on the Italian railroads have recently been conducting a peculiar sort of strike. The stoppage of work on a government railroad having been judged as conspiracy and treason, they decided to use other methods. They adopted the policy of simply enforcing all rules. Every inspection demanded by the rules was scrupulously carried out, all stops were made exactly as ordered and as a result the trains were from two hours to a day behind time and in some cases the service was so crippled that one-fourth of the trains were entirely dropped. The government finally agreed to some slight concessions, but the struggle is not yet ended.

ENGLAND.

Keir Hardie has recently aroused considerable interest by the introduction of the following motion in the House of Commons:

"Provision of meals for school children. That, having regard to recommendations contained in the report of the Physical Deterioration Committee, particularly regarding the importance of providing proper food for children, this House declares in favour of powers being immediately conferred upon educational authorities for enabling them to charge the funds under their control with the cost of supplying meals to children attending school."

SWEDEN.

The Socialist Movement in Sweden moves steadily onward. A congress was recently held in which it was shown that the party membership had increased from twenty thousand in 1897 to forty-four thousand in 1900 and at the present time it is over sixty-three thousand.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Strategy of Great Railroads. By Frank H. Spearman. Charles Scribner's Sons. Cloth, 287 pages, \$1.50.

The romance of the future will be but the telling of the facts of history and contemporary life. Such a romance is this. It bears the marks of the journalist. Its easy flowing style, striking sentences, and especially the "feature" character of each "story," tell of the trained journalist; rather than the economist or historian. Each system is given one central characteristic, in obedience to the standard rule of what makes a good newspaper "story." The Vanderbilt lines are the lines of good management; the Pennsylvania of detail and traffic triumphs; the Harriman system centers around its great engineering works, and so on through the list. This method of writing adds much to the readability of the work, rather than to its value as a work of reference. Yet its merits are great as a treatise on American railroads and railroading. Each one of the great railroad systems is taken up in turn and its extent and characteristic features sketched with skillful hand. The problem of labor-saving in connection with railroading resolves itself into two parts, according as the permanent way or the rolling stock is considered. It is in regard to the first that the most far-reaching changes have been made, although sometimes the latter have been more evident. But in railroad construction almost fabulous sums have been expended in the abolition of grades and curves and the acquirement of terminals. Many interesting facts crop out now and then, (this is not to say that the whole work is not intensely interesting) as when he shows how the improvement of transportation facilities has wiped out the elevator business in Chicago. For the general reader, again, such a work is far superior to the average commercial geography of the United States. The very valuable set of maps contributes much to its value in this respect, and so thoroughly has he covered the ground that an almost exhaustive picture of the resources of the sections tributary to the various systems is presented. Taking the railroads as the center around which to group these facts gives a unity to the whole that impresses it upon the mind of the reader far better than any dry-text-book recital. The last two chapters on "The First Transcontinental Road" and "The Early Day in Railroading," supply the historical perspective that would otherwise be lacking to the picture.

Human Submission. By Morrison I. Swift. The Liberty Press, Philadelphia. Paper, 97 pages, 25 cents.

A well written but largely metaphysical discussion of the effect of submission in perpetuating slavery. The author still considers that ideas are ruling the world, yet all through his work is running a chain of reasoning based on industrial evolution.

Politics in New Zealand: By C. F. Taylor. Equity Series. C. F. Taylor. Paper, 108 pages, 25 cents.

This is a condensation of the much larger book "The Story of New Zealand." For those desiring information on this country of social experiments there is nothing better. Everything, however, is treated in the most rosy manner and nothing is said of the dark side of the picture. One would never gain from this that there had been unemployed riots in New Zealand within the last few years. However, for those who wish information on practical legislation there is undoubtedly much to be gained from a study of work done in New Zealand. The comparisons, however, which are usually made between that still practically uncaptialized country and the United States are generally wholly unjustifiable.

Is It So Impracticable? or A Trust for All the People: By Chilton Rowe. Gardner G. Willard. Paper, 37 pages.

A well written treatment of Socialism as a scheme. Probably this author's guesses are as good as most of those who have written on this subject. He makes some interesting computations as to the waste entailed upon society by the legal profession. How far he is from the international position is shown in his conclusions where he declares that it has not been his aim "to stir up class hatred, human nature at bottom runs about the same in all classes. * * * It is his wish to help support and to intensify among all men of all classes that just abhorrence of the individualistic system of life." However, since human minds are made up in the most diverse ways it is probable that some would be reached by this method of propaganda who would be wholly inaccessible to a more scientific statement of Socialist doctrine.

The Way Out: By D. Wilmot Smith. The James H. Barry Company. Paper, 169 pages, 25 cents.

This work has the appearance of having been made up as a scrap book, with but very little connection between its different parts. Some portions are good and some indifferent. The philosophy on which it is based is as variable as the literary style and general make-up of the book.

Socialism and Human Nature Do They Conflict? By Murray E. King. Charles H. Kerr & Company. Paper, 30 pages, 10 cents.

This article attracted so much attention in THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW that it has now been reprinted in a neat pamphlet. There are few things in the English language that form a better philosophical foundation for Socialism than does this little work.

The Scab: By Jack London. Charles H. Kerr & Company. Paper, 25 pages. Pocket Library Series, 5 cents.

There is no man writing stronger English today than Jack London and for that reason the strength which he brings to the Socialist Movement is proportionately great. What he has to say strikes with force and nowhere is this better seen than in his little pamphlet on "The Scab." One may criticise the scientific accuracy of his definition "that a scab is one who gives more value for the same price than another." Yet the way in which he explains his meaning shows that he understands the real social position of the scab.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS.

We are now prepared to make the most important announcement since the organization of our co-operative publishing house. The floating debt to outsiders has now been practically wiped out, partly by direct contributions from stockholders, and partly by four per cent loans. The number of stockholders is steadily increasing, and with it the demand for socialist books. In short, the company is now in a position where it can take up a new work with every prospect of success. And there is a work for which the need is urgent.

The doctrines of Socialism rest on the solid foundation of natural science. Marx has often been called the Darwin of sociology. The laws which he discovered in social science are in many ways analogous to those unfolded by Darwin and subsequent writers on evolution. The connection, however, is closer than that of a mere analogy or likeness. The laws of natural science and the laws in sociology which lead to socialism are part of the same system.

The fact that these scientific foundations are lacking in the public mind is one of the greatest obstacles to the progress of socialism. The German socialists have long recognized this and circulate the works of Darwin and Huxley along with those of Marx and Engels. In America, however, this side of the work has been largely neglected. To this fact is due, to a large extent, the lack of scientific accuracy which is so marked a characteristic of the American Socialist Movement.

There have recently appeared in Germany a series of very remarkable little works which combine to a very high degree scientific accuracy and popular language. We have arranged to have several of these translated and supplemented by original works by American writers. These books are written in an extremely interesting manner.

The opening volume of the series is "The Evolution of Man," by Wilhelm Boelsche, a scientist and lecturer who is also a socialist, and who is recognized as the popularizer of Darwinism in Germany. This volume has been translated for us by Ernest Untermann and it is now being printed. It traces the ancestry of man step by step back through the various forms of life down to the simplest organism, showing that the "missing links" so dear to the theologians have all disappeared, and

finally it shows that there is no fixed line of division, even between the so-called organic and inorganic, but that the same vital force molds the crystal that molds the cell.

The book is fully illustrated with pictures designed not to ornament it but to make its meaning clear to the ordinary reader. It is a book that every socialist will enjoy.

Moreover, it has a propaganda value that must not be forgotten. If a man who works for his living is conservative, attached to the existing social order, it is generally because he has a vague sort of feeling that the ruling class are the special favorites of a supreme being whom it is hopeless to resist. Once make it clear to him how the world has really developed, and he is ready to become a revolutionist.

This is precisely the work that will be done by "The Evolution of Man" and the later volumes in the series. They do not attack popular superstitions or institutions; they simply give the wider outlook from which the absurdity of both capitalism and theology becomes plain.

"The Evolution of Man" and the later volumes in the series will be published in the same convenient form which has proved so popular in the Standard Socialist Series, but the color of the cloth binding will be blue instead of red, and the word Socialism will not be made prominent, if it appears at all it will be in advertising at the end of the book. The retail price will be fifty cents; the price to stockholders thirty cents by mail or twenty-five cents by express at purchaser's expense.

The first cost of bringing out this book is about four hundred dollars. If every reader of the REVIEW will act promptly this money can be raised by the last of April, when we expect to have copies ready. If you are a stockholder, send a cash-in-advance order for as many copies as you can expect to sell; you will find it the easiest book to sell that we ever published. If you are not a stockholder, become one now. Your money will be used to hasten the publication of these books of science, and you will get the advantage of reduced rates on these books as well as on the books that the money of other stockholders has already published. The stock will cost you ten dollars, payable all at once or a dollar a month, as you prefer.

There will be no delay in the publication of "The Evolution of Man," it will be published just as soon as the printers and binders can finish their work. But the publication of the next volume of the series will depend on our success in raising capital.

THE DEBT-RAISING FUND.

In June, 1904, Charles H. Kerr sent to the other stockholders in the co-operative publishing house an offer that he would contribute out of money due him from the publishing house a sum equal to all contributions of others, for the sake of paying off the floating debt to non-stockholders. The total contributions to this fund in 1904 were \$3,221.52. During 1905 the contributions have been as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$205.48
Local Richmond, Virginia	1.00

C. F. Bardorf, Quebec	5.00
Alexander Schablik, Washington	4.00
J. O. Duckett, California	2.00
A. H. Floaten, Colorado	5.00
Howard Keehn, Pennsylvania	2.00
Martin Nelson, Arizona	5.80
William Bateman, Iowa	2.50
Ulysses S. Drayer, Pennsylvania	2.80
Jack Williams, Washington50
F. Anderson, Washington	1.00
Vernon Handy, Colorado	40.00
Gus Weiss, California	2.50
George D. Herron, New Jersey	10.00
Albert Smith, Maryland	1.00
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	84.30
Total for 1905	\$374.08
Total from beginning	\$3595.60

The original offer to duplicate the contributions of all other stockholders expired Dec. 31, 1904; it was extended to March 31, 1905. As the purpose of the offer has practically been accomplished, and as the constant appeals for contributions placed a heavy burden on those whose enthusiasm exceeded their resources, it seems best not to extend it further; except as to large contributions, such as come from those who can contribute without distress to themselves. The manager of the co-operative publishing house will therefore agree for the remainder of the year 1905 to duplicate all contributions of fifty dollars or more, the money to be used for the purpose of publishing new volumes in the Library of Science for the Workers.

He has also voluntarily reduced the rate of interest on the money due him from the publishing house to four per cent, and will add his personal guarantee to the note of the company for any sum lent on sixty days' call at four per cent. Two thousand dollars could be used to advantage to publish the first five books of the new series within the next four months. The money could easily be returned within a year from the sale of stock and books, or it could be used to advantage to bring out additional volumes.

THE RECORDING ANGEL.

Copies of this book will be in circulation by the time this issue of the REVIEW is in the hands of its subscribers. The advance orders received before publication amount to 600, all received within a very few weeks, and most of them in response to advertisements in a few socialist periodicals. A full description of this remarkable novel by Edwin Arnold Brenholtz will be found on page 575 of last month's REVIEW. It is a book that no socialist reader will miss if he can help it. The price is one dollar with the usual discount to stockholders.

ROBERT HUNTER'S "POVERTY."

As we go to press, word is received from Macmillan & Co., that a paper edition of "Poverty" at 25 cents will be ready about April 25. We have placed a large advance order, and shall be able to supply copies at the 25 cent rate including postage. We can not, however, sell the book at a discount.